DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 965 HE 006 569

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | The Foreign Undergraduate Student: Institutional Priorities for Action. |
| INSTITUTION | College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | 75 |
| NOTE | 118p.; Papers presented at a colloquium sponsored by The National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions (Racine, Wisconsin, June 20-21, 1974) |
| AVAILABLE FROM | College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815 Princeton, N.J. 08540 ($2.50) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.76 PLUS POSTAGE. HC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Admission Criteria; Colleges; Community Colleges; Financial Support; Foreign Countries; *Foreign Student Advisers; *Foreign Students; *Higher Education; Information Dissemination; Organizations (Groups); Proprietary Schools; *Undergraduate Students; *Undergraduate Study; Universities |

ABSTRACT

A group representing United States higher education, Federal Government, foundations, and professional agencies and associations met to discuss the issue of the impact that undergraduate foreign students and United States postsecondary education have on each other. The meeting was organized around three prepared papers. The papers dealt with the ideal, the real, and the practical approach to undergraduate foreign student programs. This document reprints those papers. With insights gathered from the colloquium, some guidelines were established that might be utilized entirely or in part by institutions, government, professional associations, and foundations as they develop an achievable strategy, one in which the "ideal," or the dream, and the "real" with all its existing constraints, were concurrently examined. Some recommendations include: (1) information sources overseas; (2) integrity in admissions; (3) clearinghouses; (4) curricular reform; (5) legislation; (6) service to institutions; (7) institutional self-study; (8) research; (9) two-year colleges; (10) proprietary schools; (11) liaison with financial aid office; (12) accrediting; (13) international foreign student association. (Author/KE)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CEEB
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED109965

# The Foreign Undergraduate Student: Institutional Priorities for Action

*A colloquium held at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin*
*June 20-21, 1974*

*Sponsored by:*

The National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions

*composed of:*

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

College Entrance Examination Board

Council of Graduate Schools

Institute of International Education

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

HE 016 569

College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1975

Copies of this book have been distributed by the member organizations of the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions. Additional copies can be obtained from College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. The price is $2.50.

Inquiries regarding this booklet should be addressed to Editorial Office, College Entrance Examination Board, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019.

Copyright © 1975 by College Entrance Examination Board
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 74-25880
Printed in the United States of America

# Contents

Foreword. *v*

Preface. *vii*

1. Introduction. *1*

2. In Quest of the Ideal, by Alistair W. McCrone. *4*

Responses to the Paper. *37*
*Reports from the Discussion Groups. 37*
*Remarks from the Chairman. 46*
*General Colloquium Discussion. 47*

3. The Now Reality, by A. Lee Zeigler. *52*

Responses to the Paper. *67*
*Reports from the Discussion Groups. 67*
*Remarks from the Chairman. 73*
*General Colloquium Discussion. 74*

4. A Practical Approach to the Development of Institutional Priorities, by Hugh M. Jenkins. *79*

Responses to the Paper. *97*
*Reports from the Discussion Groups. 97*
*General Colloquium Discussion. 101*

5. Recommendations. *103*

List of Participants. *107*

Selected Bibliography. *110*

# Foreword

"The Undergraduate Foreign Student: Institutional Priorities for Action" was the theme of the third colloquium on foreign students sponsored by the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions (NLC), which is composed of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the College Entrance Examination Board, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States (CGS), the Institute of International Education (IIE), and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA). The colloquium was held in cooperation with The Johnson Foundation at Wingspread, the foundation's conference center, in Racine, Wisconsin, in June 1974. Administrative costs incurred by the National Liaison Committee and the cost of publishing this book were covered through a grant from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU) of the Department of State.

The two previous NLC-sponsored colloquia on foreign students were also held at Wingspread. *University, Government, and the Foreign Graduate Student* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1969, 57 pp.) is a collection of papers from the first colloquium, which was held in March 1967. The second was held in June 1970, and a book containing its findings was published as *The Foreign Graduate Student: Priorities for Research and Action* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971, 98 pp.).

The director of the 1974 colloquium was Clifford F. Sjogren, director of admissions at the University of Michigan. Background papers for the colloquium were prepared and presented by Alistair W. McCrone, president of Humboldt State University; A. Lee Zeigler, director of the Bechtel International Center at Stanford University; and Hugh M. Jenkins, executive vice president of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Diane L. Olsen, chief editor of publications at the College Board, wrote summaries of the discussions and recommendations of the colloquium and was responsible for preparing this book, with the assistance of a reading committee composed of Gloria H. Ilic, division head of foreign student placement at the

Institute of International Education, and Joel B. Slocum, director of foreign student services at Columbia University.

The National Liaison Committee is indebted to the Department of State and The Johnson Foundation for their interest in and continued support of this project.

*Sanford C. Jameson*
Chairman, National Liaison Committee

June 1974

# Preface

A group representing United States higher education, federal government, foundations, and professional agencies and associations convened at The Johnson Foundation Conference Center, Wingspread, in Racine, Wisconsin, in June 1974, to confront an important issue. That issue, broadly described, is the impact that undergraduate foreign students and United States postsecondary education have on each other. During the colloquium, participants examined in detail the foreign student scene, thereby achieving significant insights into the relevant characteristics of foreign student enrollment in American postsecondary institutions. With these insights, evaluated collectively, we were able to establish some guidelines that might be utilized entirely or in part by institutions, government, professional associations, and foundations as they develop international education priorities. We tried to develop an achievable strategy, one in which both the "ideal," or the dream, and the "real" with all its existing constraints, were concurrently examined.

The meeting was organized around three prepared papers, two of which were distributed to the participants before the colloquium. The papers dealt with the ideal, the real, and the practical approaches to undergraduate foreign student programs. After each paper was presented, participants separated into four groups, where the paper was discussed and a response was prepared. A spokesman for each group reported on the group session to the reassembled participants. The general discussion that followed the group sessions provided a forum for shared thinking and an opportunity to consolidate ideas, suggestions, and plans of action. The final wrap-up session provided time to frame some recommendations, or guidelines, that might be used for the development of positions on foreign student enrollments.

The initiative for the colloquium was provided by the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions (NLC). The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges was invited by the NLC to participate in the organization of the colloquium. It is indicative of the importance of the conference that the colloquium was able

to attract such prominent individuals from institutions, government, foundations, and professional agencies for the purpose of investigating an issue that has profound implications for the educational and social development of hundreds of thousands of individuals. Most participants used office or personal funds for transportation, and each contributed at least two days of time. Their demonstrated willingness to take seriously their assignment contributed substantially to the success of the endeavor.

It is appropriate to recognize the substantial contributions of Alistair W. McCrone, A. Lee Zeigler, and Hugh M. Jenkins, who presented papers at the colloquium. Each of these men conscientiously and unselfishly performed his tasks in a way that we have come to expect of only the most professionally committed individuals.

The participants specifically, and postsecondary education generally, owe an expression of appreciation to the financial sponsors of the colloquium. The Johnson Foundation, through its able representatives, Henry Halsted, Estelle Linzer, and Kay Mauer, provided a remarkable facility for our meetings and assistance with the planning and logistical details. Henry Halsted, in a letter to the participants before the colloquium, succinctly described the purpose of our mission: "Foreign students are a particularly important segment of the spectrum of persons from abroad who come to the United States. The depth and texture of their experience here, the influence that they have in promoting understanding while they are here, and the contributions they may be able to make when they return to their homelands are matters of importance to Americans, to the United States, and to the cause of international understanding."

*Cliff Sjogren*
Colloquium Director

# 1. Introduction

This book is the result of a colloquium on "The Undergraduate Foreign Student: Institutional Priorities for Action."[1] The assembly was charged with the task of preparing some responses to the stated and implied needs of many individuals. Students throughout the world continue to seek admission to colleges and universities in the United States. Foreign governments need trained people to maintain or improve their social and economic conditions, and they quite properly feel that the United States can provide that training better than most, if not all, other countries. The government, international education agencies, foundations, and professional associations need refined procedures for providing the links between foreign manpower needs and American educational resources. Colleges and universities seek diversified student populations and full or nearly full classrooms and residence halls. Finally, American students probably benefit from increased opportunities to associate with foreign students. In summary, thousands of the world's bright and academically prepared young students seek educational opportunities in hundreds of American colleges, universities, and other postsecondary institutions that have space and want students.

Unfortunately, the system does not provide for the orderly movement of those students into the institutional vacancies that were created when inflated projections of domestic student enrollments during the 1960s resulted in unused campus facilities in the 1970s. The experience of one student from West Africa demonstrates the inefficiency and the inhumaneness of current practices. While this incident is not typical, it illustrates the need for reform. The student sent admission

1. While the title of the colloquium suggests that only foreign student enrollments at two- and four-year, degree-granting institutions were examined, it soon became evident that our deliberations should include the terminal and technical offerings of community colleges and proprietary schools. In this report, therefore, most references to the "undergraduate foreign student" imply an expanded definition of the term to include all those foreign students who have completed a secondary-level program, but who are not yet enrolled in postbaccalaureate training.

and financial aid inquiries to over 100 institutions in the United States and received 80 replies, including 70 applications, over 50 catalogs, and numerous pamphlets, brochures, and other descriptive literature. Most of the information did not deal with the questions that foreign students frequently raise. The student sought help in selecting the 40 or 50 institutions to which he should apply because he "wished to keep the application investment costs under $500" (application fees, examinations, interviewing services, etc.). The costs for the student and the institutions were already extensive, and there was no assurance that there would be a proper match of a college and the student's interests, academic qualifications, and resources. Few will disagree that a process which generates excessive costs and paper in order to arrive at a decision is in need of reform.

The incident described above illustrates one of the less desirable characteristics of international educational exchange. The diverse and autonomous nature of United States postsecondary education, however, has many more pluses than minuses. Imaginative thinking and hard work will help us resolve the problems and take advantage of the strengths that have traditionally characterized higher education.

One example of creative international education programming is a plan currently under negotiation by individuals in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States. Democratization of education in West Germany has resulted in a rapidly increasing number of secondary school graduates. Because of *numerus clausus* (restricted number), German universities must refuse entrance to thousands of students who, by federal mandate, are guaranteed access to higher education facilities. America, with literally thousands of openings in its postsecondary institutions, is eager to accommodate fully funded German students. The plan consists of a process whereby the German students who could not, or chose not to, enter a German university would be placed in a participating American institution. If the plan is adopted, the interests of West Germany and the United States would be served. Further, the cause of intercultural associations would be advanced, a spin-off that would be particularly welcomed by most educators in the United States.

Undergraduate foreign students in American postsecondary institutions evidence substantial diversity. They not only come from a

variety of cultures and life styles, but they come with a multitude of different purposes, sponsorships, and educational goals. A student may be the daughter of a wealthy Hong Kong exporter, the son of a government official from Kuwait, or a member of a farm family of the Andean Range. He might also be an American Field Service student from Finland who was admitted to take a few courses at a local community college along with a regular high school program, or a Mexican who commutes daily from his border home to a Texas college. It could be a Nigerian enrolled at the University of Alaska, a special student from Japan who wants only one year of training in English and American business methods, or a hockey player from Ontario who is enrolled in a Midwestern university. We must also recognize that there are countless illegally registered aliens who enter institutions in the United States each year, most of whom require special services.

Few generalizations are applicable. The colloquium took cognizance of the diverse nature of the issue and deliberately and conscientiously developed some broad recommendations that may prove useful. The reader is asked to appreciate the limitations of this report, however, and to view this work as a point of departure for the difficult decisions that must be made by campus and agency representatives. As each institution has its unique characteristics, so, too, each foreign student has a set of needs and attitudes that cannot be easily categorized. Orderliness of process is important, but humaneness of process is paramount if we are to maintain our position of leadership in international education.

*Cliff Sjogren*

# 2. In Quest of the Ideal

*by Alistair W. McCrone*

Any new approach to the accommodation of foreign undergraduate students in America should take account of the following factors:

1. Although *absolute* numbers are increasing, the proportions of foreign students coming to America from Latin America and Europe have decreased, while the proportions from the Far East and Africa have increased significantly during the past 20 years. In the meantime the proportions from the Near and Middle East have remained rather constant. All of this must be seen in relation to the *total* eligible college-age population from those areas, and the corollary impact on both education per se and on the native country and its relations with America and other nations. Indeed, American universities are educating very large proportions of the college-eligible population of some countries. In this context we must recognize and understand the implications of the concept of the educated elite, as it applies in different countries.

2. The rationale and objectives for having foreign students in America have been stated thoroughly within the past 20 years by numerous institutions. The rationales require no alteration; it is the mode of pursuing our stated objectives that must be improved. We must both redress mistakes and take account of new conditions, both in America and throughout the world (see Shearer, pp. 612-613).[1]

We must adapt our philosophy to accommodate the increasing enlightenment among the middle classes both in America and abroad, as well as the bewildering economic, social, political, and environmental adjustments that jostled the world, especially since 1950.

3. Foreign undergraduate students have been admitted to the United States in ever-increasing numbers, but too little attention has been paid to providing for the academic and material modes for their accommodation in a manner consistent with the stated rationales and objectives for bringing them to America in the first place. Depart-

1. References are gathered at the end of McCrone's chapter, on pages 35-36.

ments have too often admitted the students without reference to the fact that foreign student advisers have to bear much of the responsibility from then on. We should either provide more help and more resources, and the means for constantly training a professional corps of foreign student advisers in America and abroad, or we should limit the number of foreign students that we admit to the United States (i.e., at levels commensurate with our capacity to provide high-quality accommodation of them).

4. Much of our preoccupation thus far has been with admission of foreign students. More attention must be paid to the students' return to their native land and the continuation of their education throughout their lifetime.

5. Until 1970, foreign undergraduate students admitted to the United States encountered rather different curriculums and modes of instruction than at present.

6. For a variety of reasons, foreign undergraduate students risk becoming alienated both from America and from their homelands and their educated countrymen, as a result of a four-year American undergraduate experience. Clearly the risks of alienation are far greater than ever before, because of curricular changes (especially the movement away from curricular structure) and the bewildering rapidity of change throughout the world. We already know ways and means to counter the forces of alienation, and we must determine to implement those that promise success.

7. Common problems among countries, rather than traditional diplomacy, will provide, it is hoped, the mortar for a new world order. Similarities between countries, rather than the differences, must be addressed by our educational philosophies. If American and foreign students alike are to benefit from international student exchange and varied international perspectives on the common problems, the curriculums of American universities should be adjusted accordingly. The foreign students are intellectual resources that can contribute to this new enlightenment, rather than being constrained as consumers of the American viewpoint.

8. Realistically, it must be recognized that pursuit of the ideal is likely to be increasingly difficult, for we must face the emerging forces of neonationalism and a corollary mood of neoisolationism.

9. This task is further compounded by both national economic stringency and emerging anti-intellectualism in American legislatures. In brief, we face diminished support (not in total amounts of money, but per student enrolled) of higher education in general, some of it necessary and some of it mildly punitive. Some of this negative influence on potential American financial support may be offset by the growing affluence of developing countries, so that direct and indirect American subsidies will be needed less and less.

Given these factors, and others to which I will refer within this broad framework, it seems clear that in pursuit of a more ideal situation for undergraduate student exchange we must begin with a renewed, refined, and strengthened commitment to it. And then we must seek to redeploy *existing* resources in much more efficient pursuit of the ideal. I would like to emphasize the following thoughts:

1. American academic institutions in particular, and other relevant institutions, should consciously and at the highest policy-making levels make the necessary commitments for high-quality international student exchange, either to do it very well or not at all. Successful fruition of such commitments will come through some new approaches, but mostly through the provision of adequate resources to pursue *present* commitments more completely and more properly.

2. We should endeavor to enroll a broad spectrum of students, with special efforts not to pass over students from the underprivileged classes of foreign countries. The American educational experience should not be a privilege restricted to established economic elites. It is one thing to foster an international "educated elite," and quite another to inadvertently perpetuate an economic elite. Doubtless, we must refine our admissions policies accordingly (see Shearer; Sjogren; Wilcox).

3. Through high-quality advisement mechanisms, coordinated both within the United States and between the United States and foreign countries, we should engender better selectivity in assignment and choice of American colleges by the foreign students, so that they never end up in mediocre academic programs.

4. We should encourage replication, throughout America, of those methodologies and programs that at present minister well to foreign students.

5. By means of a quasi-public consortium of education-orientated institutions and/or the government, the United States should go beyond its present commitments to foreign student exchange by providing resources for greater coordination among the educational, governmental, and private agencies that are at present committed to the highest standards of international education (see Barnett and Mason). Establishment of a new International Association for Foreign Student Affairs would doubtless facilitate such coordination. We should make available to the foreign student a greater range of the higher education resources that are available throughout the United States.

6. We should encourage more systematic planning of their academic programs by the foreign students (with their advisers) so that their own academic expectations and needs, in harmony with those of their native country, can be as completely satisfied as possible.

7. The negative forces of neoisolationism should be challenged by a determination to pursue higher quality in our foreign student exchange programs. It must be clear that what we do in the mid-1970s and beyond will, and must, be different from what we have done before with undergraduate foreign students.

8. "It is essential to the national interest of the United States that there be a complete reappraisal of the regulations governing the admittance and the educational experience of foreign students in the colleges and universities of this country and that such regulations be recast in the context of promoting educational interchange rather than that of controlling aliens" (Laws and Regulations, p. 6).

9. Ideally, we must do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

### *Categories and Characteristics of Foreign Students*

Regardless of country of origin and the enormous diversity of their background, the United States Naturalization Service more or less lumps all foreign students together under a few categories. Most are considered nonimmigrants, in either of two categories: F1 and J1. The F1 (student visa) requires a passport, a certificate of eligibility for study in the United States, proof of sufficient finances to pursue such studies, and proof of proficiency in the English language. The J1 (exchange visitor visa) category of foreign students comes to the United

States under the auspices of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. These students are officially "sponsored," and they may not change their status without returning to their country of origin. Occasionally a foreign student may stay in the United States for purposes of educational travel under a B2 classification—"visitor for pleasure." In 1973 the kinds of visas held by foreign students were:

| | |
|---|---|
| Immigrant visa | 19 percent |
| Student (F) visa | 48 |
| Exchange visitor (J) visa | 7 |
| Other | 3 |
| Not reported | 23 |

The laws governing foreign student entry were never designed for international educational development but, rather, for alien control (see Laws and Regulations). New laws are needed that favor the national educational interest.

The best available data on foreign students are published annually in *Open Doors*. (The following has been taken from *Open Doors, 1973*. See also Bayer.) In 1972-73 slightly more than half of the 146,000 foreign students reported in American colleges and universities were undergraduates. (Other foreign students attend secondary schools, proprietary schools, trade schools, etc.)

In 1972-73 the areas they came from were:

| | |
|---|---|
| Far East | 37 percent |
| Latin America | 19 |
| Near and Middle East | 13 |
| Europe | 11 |
| North America | 7 |
| Africa | 8 |

In 1972-73 more than half of all foreign students attended colleges or universities in just six states:

| | |
|---|---|
| California | 15.5 percent |
| New York | 12.2 |
| Florida | 6.7 |
| Illinois | 6.0 |
| Texas | 5.4 |
| Michigan | 4.8 |

Principal fields of study chosen in 1972-73 by foreign students were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Engineering | 22 percent |
| Humanities | 16 |
| Physical and life sciences | 14 |
| Social sciences | 12 |
| Business administration | 13 |
| Medical sciences | 6 |
| Education | 5 |
| Agriculture | 2 |

Foreign students are exceedingly diverse in terms of the kinds of financial support that they bring with them, their national and cultural background, their family background, their age and experience, their chosen fields of study, and the kinds of institutions to which they go in the United States.

*Financial Support.* Some foreign students come to the United States under the auspices of private American institutions such as churches, charities, and foundations. Comparatively little subsidy of foreign students is provided by public agencies. Many foreign students resort to part-time employment during their stay in the United States, a practice which will be limited henceforth according to new federal regulations that require foreign students seeking summer jobs to obtain permission from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, rather than from school officials. Part-time employment during the academic year is not yet similarly restricted. Needless to say, it is very important that as long as they must pay tuition, foreign students should be allowed to work in the United States, just as Americans are allowed to work and attend state-supported universities in foreign lands.

The majority of foreign students in America are self-supporting, either by their own or their family's resources. This fact indicates that substantial numbers of well-to-do and educated foreign families tend to at least perpetuate if not elevate their economic position in society by means of education secured in the United States.

Financial support data were obtained from some 82,433 foreign students in 1972-73. Of this sample, source of support was identified as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| United States government | 3.9 percent of students |
| Foreign government | 5.7 |
| Self-supporting | 59.8 |
| United States college or university | 21.6 |
| United States college plus other | 2.1 |
| Private institutions | 6.4 |
| Private institutions plus other | 0.5 |

The high self-support figure is, of course, attributable in substantial measure to the financial requirements of the student visa.

*Educational and Cultural Background.* Foreign students who have attended private secondary schools are quite different in outlook, abilities, and expectations, from those who attended foreign public schools. The ideal system of foreign student exchange should accommodate these kinds of differences (together with other factors growing out of differences in family background, age, and experience) and what and where they want to study. The problem of their accommodation is further compounded according to the kind of institution they attend in the United States.

It should also be noted, that every foreign student has some unrealistic preconceptions regarding the United States. American news media typically succeed in projecting an image of America that is highlighted by jet aircraft, automobiles, skyscrapers, newness, sanitation, universal affluence, crime and violence, and bizarre behavior. An ideal accommodation for foreign students should provide an orientation experience in which these kinds of preconceptions can be properly modified so that unwarranted disappointment and disillusionment can be judiciously avoided.

Other aspects of accommodation, which we must label in general as "cultural shock," are dealt with in Shearer, p. 615; Lewis; and especially D. C. Johnson.

### *Relevant National and International Issues*

A number of other factors will necessarily condition the formulation of any ideal undergraduate foreign student program. In addition to the facts and trends outlined so completely by Shearer (pp. 612-618) and Walton, consider the following perspectives:

*1. Neonationalism.* Paradoxically, the rise of nationalism in several (par-

ticularly European) countries appears in the technically advanced nations—the very nations with the greatest potential to make or break the new international order. This new nationalism appears in untimely contradiction to what the world is really like and what the world really needs. Clearly student exchange provides counterpoise to neonationalism.

*2. The Concept of the Educated Elite.* Comparatively small percentages of the population of most foreign countries go to their universities—less than 14 percent of European students and far fewer than that in most other countries of the world. Thus, comparatively speaking, the potential impact of foreign students educated in the United States is quite great, even in the technically advanced countries, for they can constitute a substantial percentage of their total educated class.

The comparatively small numbers of people in foreign lands who receive a college education may be looked upon as a kind of educated elite. Foreign students educated in the United States will be a significant part of this elite, who indeed embody great potential among the future policy makers and world leaders. There is nothing odious about recognizing the existence of such educated elites throughout the world. We cannot avoid having to deal with the educated elite, because the very same preselection processes (whether they be financial or mental) that enable students to pursue study in the United States are such as to foster a *de facto* elite class, even in countries where political philosophies that decry "elites" would seem to indicate otherwise.

Because these budding "elites" are highly impressionable, like young Americans of similar age, there should be an opportunity for each foreign student to have a diversity of educational exposures and experiences, which will reveal the true breadth, balance, and vitality of the American culture. A diverse experience within the freedoms and viability of the American educational system (and value system) will be the most plausible counterpoise to Vietnam- and Watergate-inspired misconceptions.

*3. The Turbulent Decade, 1964-74.* Foreign students who graduated from American universities at the end of the 1960s must have taken back to their home countries a variety of grossly distorted pictures of American values and institutions. It therefore seems reasonable that the imagery of American student activism and guerrilla behavior, which

proved so disturbing to both domestic and foreign undergraduates in the late 1960s, should be counterbalanced by the perceptions of a new generation of students who are educated under the conditions of the 1970s.[2]

Of even greater significance is the fact that during the period 1964-74 the curriculums of most American universities and colleges were vastly overhauled. Indeed, many of the old classroom-oriented learning experiences gave way to many different approaches to teaching and learning—among them cluster colleges, lifelong learning, universities-without-walls, undergraduate internships, co-op education, self-paced learning, and team-teaching. Many foreign students are influenced in their choice of American institutions by countrymen who were foreign students in America. American higher education is very different now, and it seems important that a new generation of foreign undergraduate students should have the chance to be clearly apprised of this new reality through their own experience and education.

*4. Emergence of the Enlightened Middle Class.* Because of television and increased travel opportunities (including the overseas experiences of many Americans in three wars), as well as the presence of many foreign students in America during the past 25 years, the average rural, as well as urban, American is much more sophisticated in international concerns than ever before. For these and a variety of other reasons, the average American has lost most of the old "National Geographic" viewpoints of foreign countries and peoples. Accordingly, there is much less chance today for the kind of embarrassment of foreign students that is attributable to provinciality and naivete on the part of the average American layman. Nowadays foreign students can be graciously accommodated, and with considerable intellectual sophistication, wherever they attend college. American colleges and universities are substantially middle-class institutions—*not* elitist—devoted, consciously or subconsciously, to the development of an

2. This is not to suggest that American student unrest of the 1960s was unique, for we know that far worse has been experienced in Greece, Japan, and Latin America for years. The point is that this was a unique episode in *American* educational history; and foreign students need to recognize its constructive results in a society where democracy has been the rule, not merely unfulfilled ambition.

enlightened middle class in America. An exposure of foreign students to the American middle class should therefore be most illuminating by revealing that, regardless of one's country of origin, there are many problems that are common to all nations and to all of humanity as it "develops."

Through student experiences and training in an advanced nation such as the United States, the potential progress of the so-called underdeveloped nations can be greatly enhanced. They need not repeat and suffer from the many technical errors that have been committed by the so-called developed countries, and which are now manifest in such things as pollution, urban decay, social unrest, and shortages of critical commodities.

Because of neonationalism and because of common problems that cross national boundaries, the old classical diplomacy is no longer able to cope with modern international realities. Our hope for future generations surely lies in the kind of mutual understanding that grows out of common experiences that are provided through the agency of student exchange.

*5. Alienation of the Foreign Student.* Despite the best intentions of their American hosts, some (a minority) of the foreign students who come here return to their homeland with hostile and bitter feelings toward the United States—feelings that may have several causes.

For one, foreign students who attend large universities sometimes tend to develop their own ghettos on campus by associating as much as possible with other students from their own country, with whom they have much in common. And, in the absence of fellow countrymen, foreign students often take comfort from the company of other foreign students, from whose similar difficulties with the language, bewilderment in a new culture, and so on, they draw comfort and a measure of psychological self-support. That is, instead of becoming immersed in American culture, they may live in a kind of ghetto from which they can acquire only a narrow view of America.[3]

Also this kind of self-imposed detachment from American culture, which fosters anti-Americanism and bitterness, can be compounded

3. There is, of course, a value in, and a psychological need for, occasional gatherings of fellow countrymen.

by the very nature of the institution itself. American universities often have some faculty who feel it is their professional responsibility to be enlightened critics of American institutions. Indeed, some may argue that this is what universities are for. Impressionable foreign undergraduates may get the impression that even the Americans are knocking America; and therefore anti-American sentiments are easily aroused within them.

Another characteristic of the American university that may foster foreign students' antipathy toward the United States is that the university itself (particularly the residential university or college) is, by its very nature, detached from society in general. It has its own residence halls, food services, and recreational facilities; and any student can live rather a full life without spending much time away from the campus.

It is gratifying that many of the alienating circumstances encountered in America by foreigners before 1970 (such as housing discrimination and barbershop discrimination) are substantially diminished. Especially praiseworthy is the fact that it was the American colleges and universities that spearheaded many such social reforms, with the students in particular leading the way. Because many of the old causes for alienation of the foreigner are now being remedied, foreign undergraduates of the 1970s really have a much different American experience than their countrymen who graduated before 1970.

If alienation of foreign students from America is a problem, it is even more serious when foreign students return to their own country only to find that they are effectively alienated from it, too. Four years as an undergraduate in America is a large proportion of a student's life and a critical time in his or her development. The student cannot readily escape acquisition and absorption of the imprint of American influences and becomes somewhat out of touch with the home country—and therefore mildly alienated from it, until reassimilated.

*6. Foreign Graduate Students Compared with Undergraduates.* Foreign graduate students get a much narrower view of America than the undergraduates, because of both their limited curricular focus and the limited number of their day-to-day American associates. Another significant difference is that graduate students, because they are older

and more discipline-oriented, are less susceptible to alienation from their own native values and customs and can maintain a judgmental perspective on the new things they see and experience in America. It is possible that the experience of foreign undergraduates in a large university may alienate them more from their contemporary graduate countrymen upon their return home, than from the Americans!

Perhaps this is the time to raise the question, then, of whether America should admit foreign undergraduates at all, given such possibilities for alienation. Or, should undergraduates from foreign universities be admitted to American universities for only a year or two of study but *not* to pursue bachelor's degrees? The obvious objection to this suggestion is on the grounds of denial of educational opportunity to the majority, for whom there is no place in foreign universities.

Another question is what the relationship will be between the American-educated undergraduate and the American-educated graduate in the employment structure of their own country. Is it worth considering whether a graduate with a terminal bachelor's degree will inevitably become the staff assistant or paraprofessional associate of an even narrower "elite" of doctoral degree holders? These theoretical questions are doubtless more significant when applied to developing countries than to the advanced nations.

Graduate-degree holders are much more likely to become teachers or professors in their homeland; therefore the experience and perception of the bachelor's degree holders may have much less impact on the native culture. Perhaps this effect is offset by the slightly greater numbers of undergraduates, but I think not, because it is likely that "the balance of foreign student enrollment will shift more to the graduate level" (Shearer, p. 613).

7. *Existing Accommodations.* Most major American universities have foreign student advisers and special wings of the admissions office to deal with foreign students. Most of these people who deal intimately with the many technical and psychological problems that concern foreign students have had to acquire their training empirically, on the job, with variable success. A more ideal and helpful solution will be proposed later.

A small but growing number of American institutions are actively recruiting foreign students, particularly small, private colleges, where

dependence on tuition puts the recruitment of foreign students fairly high on the list of priorities that are designed to assure institutional survival. Bluntly stated, we must recognize that, in growing measure, foreign students may be recruited to some institutions less for academic reasons than for financial ones related to financial survival of the college. Therefore some foreign undergraduates might unknowingly choose mediocre academic environments, despite the fact that many high-quality opportunities are available to them. An ideal system of foreign undergraduate admissions would have to remedy this situation by introducing screening of colleges as well as students.

It is encouraging to observe that many institutions have developed enlightened policies for the proper accommodation of foreign students. In the California State University and Colleges, for example (Opstad *et al*), the California legislature has taken the position that foreign students should pay the same fees as out-of-state Americans and that foreign student advisers should be funded out of such fees rather than student fees—as was the practice before 1970. Although this might discourage some foreign students from entering the California state university system, a good compromise has been legislatively authorized whereby the tuition could be waived for up to 7 percent of all foreign undergraduates and up to 25 percent for foreign graduate students.[4]

A sure sign that foreigners value an American undergraduate education and are willing to pay for it is the fact that the number of foreign students in the California State University and College System is rising despite the rise in fees.

Whether or not we should exclude foreign undergraduates (implicitly, in favor of graduate students), we should at least discourage them from coming to pursue undergraduate professional degrees (which should be earned, if possible, at home, and then followed, as necessary, by graduate professional study in America). We should avoid any suggestion that, by limiting the numbers of foreign students in America, we are retrogressing into a kind of neoisolationism, but stress instead that our concern is for doing a better job for foreign stu-

4. The provision was enacted by the state legislature, but to date implementation has been delayed by lack of sufficient funding.

dents within the limits of our ability to provide advisers, tutors, contacts, and so on.

The question of the form, conditions, justification, and amount of subsidy for foreign students must be considered in our pursuit of the ideal. The time seems right for greater national and intra- and interstate unity of effort in this area, and pooling of present resources, without sacrificing the very diversity and openness that is the essence of the American education system. Attention should be given to the means of securing the financial support for such coordinated efforts and revealing their value to the public.

*8. The Principle of Equality for Foreign Students.* The prevailing, well-intentioned principle is that when foreign students come to America they should be treated as much as possible in the same way as American students—and we all know the practical difficulties of following it. In some instances legally based equality that we grant to foreign students could be extended. Ideally foreign students, once admitted, should be eligible to apply to all sources of financial aid that are accessible to American students. However, the difficulties of doing this in the face of rising fees, are clear to everyone.

It is undesirable, from the academic as well as social point of view, to segregate foreign undergraduates from their American counterparts. Ideal living arrangements place them together in university residence halls, despite the fact that this might limit the foreign students' intercourse with American society generally. (I am not really troubled by the latter notion, for I am among those who believe that much of the benefit of a university is derived from its detachment from the daily hurly-burly of society. Indeed, this is the foundation of a university's ability to make objective analyses of society.) However, there is a great deal of interplay between the modern college and the community-at-large, and ideally, foreign students should share in it.

Clearly, the principle of equal treatment for foreign students brings with it the risk of their partial assimilation into the American culture —at least to the degree at which there is a chance that the students may be alienated from their home culture. An ideal compromise, or at least a hedge against these risks, is to provide for a student's return to his or her homeland at least once or twice during the undergraduate years.

9. *The Advantages of Smallness.* Many students will return to countries where the institutions and laboratories are not as well equipped as in America. Therefore an educational experience in, say, a small, rural college that likewise lacks elaborate instrumentation and library resources, may indeed be more realistic and transferable.

## *The Ideal: Philosophic Basis for Accommodating Foreign Undergraduates in America*

The sources and development of scholarship traverse all boundaries of community, state, nation, or continent (Dremuk), and the nature of the universal search for truth is such that all colleges and universities must embody a fundamental need and obligation to communicate among scholars throughout the known world. Consequently, foreign students in attendance at foreign centers of learning are a natural fact of life. "Foreign" students are known to have been present in the Levant some 2,000 years ago (see Johnson; Caldwell), and such universities as Padua, Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh have always accommodated foreign students. Indeed, the present state of world civilization may be attributable in significant measure to such interchange of scholars.

It is obvious that among civilized men there has been, is, and will be a compulsion and a satisfaction in foreign study. As a corollary to this, given America's dynamic and global influence and the fact that English is now the international language (and the language of the global information society), the accommodation of foreign students in America is profoundly significant in worldwide terms.

The most elementary studies of history show how diplomacy was used to effect harmony among nations. Self-interest was always the motivation—but very narrow, geographically local self-interest. I submit that although self-interest endures as a motivating force, it can no longer be narrowly focused. Indeed, local self-interest cannot now be separated from the global self-interests of mankind. Thus, the traditional diplomacy is outmoded, and it must be supplanted by something that can be had only through international education—namely, unity achieved through the common pursuit of solutions for common problems such as health, education, pollution, and social reorientation. We have reached the point in world affairs at which, henceforth,

everybody wins or everybody loses. International student exchange, therefore, has its value in unveiling different perspectives on common problems. America is especially significant in all of this, for it is here that problems attending a growing technical society are already at hand. Empirically, America is a laboratory in which the results of many experiments are already known. The world order will surely benefit when all nations have learned to surmount and avoid America's kinds of mistakes and to embrace her successes. First-hand exposure of foreign undergraduates to the American experience must surely be worth both our attention and our determination to make that exposure as richly rewarding as possible. Conversely, foreign students are essential to the contemporary education of American youth.

Paul Opstad (p. 1), speaking for the California State University and College System, said: "America has become, educationally, a 'most favored nation.' This development is the result of several forces—including (1) the shift in relationships which has moved the United States, along with very few other nations, into the center of world power and responsibility; (2) the need of newly emerging nations for a well-educated citizenry to assure responsible positions; and (3) the limited opportunity for higher education in most areas of the world. The commitments of American colleges and universities to programs of international exchange are permanent, and they are expanding at an ever increasing pace." (For a more elaborate statement of trends influencing and/or favoring accommodations of foreign students see Shearer, pp. 612-613.)

There are many other established commitments to, and statements of principles and objectives as to the value of foreign student exchange.[5] One of the more succinct statements of purpose is that of the

5. See the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961: "The purpose of this Act is to enable the government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements which unite us with other nations, and the contribution being made toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for people throughout the world; to promote international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world."

California State University and College System (Opstad *et al.*, p. 4; see also Laws and Regulations, pp. 5, 6). Slightly rephrased as follows, its applicability can be national and can constitute the essence of our philosophy for the ideal approach to the accommodation of foreign undergraduates in America. "The primary purpose of the foreign student programs is the direct education of the foreign student. Further, full use should be made of the foreign student as a resource for enhancing the educational experience of American undergraduates.

"The presence of foreign students on American campuses will enable these students to better satisfy their professional and educational aspirations. The opportunities made available should be consistent with the needs of both the students and the countries to which they will return.

"The presence of foreign students enables American colleges and universities to do a better job of educating their own students. Americans must learn to see themselves, their professions, and their country in an international context if they are to successfully discharge the tasks of political, economic, and intellectual leadership assigned to them in today's world. The presence of foreign students fosters greater appreciation of other peoples, cultures, and viewpoints.

"The presence of foreign students will enable American colleges and universities to contribute to the social and economic development of other nations through the education and training of leaders who will determine the future of those nations."

"The exchange of foreign students will favor communication and understanding among people of different nations, thereby favoring world peace.[6] Mere contact between peoples is not sufficient to foster such understanding or favorable attitudes. In fact, carelessly handled, such contacts may formulate negative attitudes.

"The development and conduct of foreign student programs should be undertaken only insofar as the resources of the college or university are sufficient to support such programs at a quality level.

"Foreign student programs should be systematically evaluated peri-

6. A corollary benefit would be that American foreign policy could be drafted more reasonably and realistically when other nations' viewpoints are better understood.

odically to assure that the above-mentioned principles are being fulfilled."

Ideally, these goals should be pursued at the institutional, state, and national levels. And to them should be added the important suggestion that foreign students should have opportunities to study in more than one American institution, preferably of different sizes, and in different geographic settings, so as to provide an opportunity to perceive the diversity that exists within the United States and to which American cultural vitality is substantially attributable.

Finally, we must both retain and be willing to invest in the American principle of "education for all" as being as valid and desirable for all countries as it is for the United States. Stated in purely idealistic terms, if a single foreign student receives an education in the United States who would otherwise have been denied an education altogether, the enterprise is worthwhile and the world is that much the better for future generations. It is from the totality of such individual commitments that the presence of foreign undergraduates in America is in keeping with the principles, now recognizably exportable, on which our nation was founded.

The ideal has already been conceived. It remains to implement such principles effectively.

## In Pursuit of the Ideal: Proposals and Rationale for Action

Assuming that we have sufficiently good philosophic and practical reasons to favor the presence of foreign undergraduates in America, our challenge seems to be that for their proper accommodation we must see to the following:

- Selection of the students in terms of basic abilities, communicative skills, and cultural background (see Shearer). Improved coordination of selection and potential assignment is needed.
- Preparation and orientation of the students for an American experience, in their own country before they come to the United States and on arrival in the United States.

- Assignment and accommodation of the student in America with a view toward the kind and location of institution (see Sjogren).
- Avoidance of alienation from both the student's homeland and the United States.
- Orientation for the return to and reassimilation in the home country.

Although some progress has been made thus far (see Matteson), all of this will require vastly more cooperation among Americans, as well as between American and foreign agencies, than has been usual.

### *Framework for Action*

Most of the following recommended practices are at present occurring in at least a few places, in greater or lesser degree. Even though they are not new, they are presented here as part of an ideal framework. Close approach to the ideal will be manifest through the degree to which some or all of these limited but enlightened practices become universally common. In pursuing the ideal perhaps some new *laws* must be enacted. Recommended practices include the following.

*1. Selection of Students.* Shao (p. 30) formulated a general profile of the kind or class of foreign students that should be admitted to American colleges and universities: "The foreign student should be capable of communicating aspects of his home culture in order to become a contributing member of the academic community in the United States. What we need to do is search out the foreign student who is well versed in his own cultural heritage and is dedicated to its integrity and advancement. Even if we need to insist that the foreign student must have had two years of advanced education in his own country to enable him to express steadily the values of his culture, we should do so.

"Another qualification we must take into consideration of the prospective student is his place in the social structure of his country. If we admit the foreign student, coming only on his own behalf [to further his own ambitions], he should pay the full cost of his education. However, we must actively recruit and support students of intellectual promise from the underprivileged strata of developing nations. [Increased American government support for the latter class of students should be engendered.]

"The foreign student should be able to use the English language

with some facility. If he does not, he should be given the necessary training. American church-sponsored and other overseas secondary schools could assist in this effort.

"The foreign student should possess some extra talents that can be tapped to enrich the total international educational activities of the particular [American] college in which he is enrolled. For instance, he may be a promising instrumentalist. . . , woodcarver. . . , folk dancer . . . or distance runner.

"Above all, the foreign student should be a person of demonstrable qualities of leadership with a deep sense of commitment to the welfare of his own country and his people."

*2. Orientation at Home.* In addition to language preparation, the prospective foreign student should receive in his own country a modest orientation for his life experiences in the United States. This could include instruction about American families, schools, and housing, and the monetary, political, transportation, and communications systems. Especially desirable (most of all for students from developing countries) would be advice about what it means psychologically to be away so long from one's own family and other social supports. Some anticipation and explanation of racial and other prejudice, could also be desirable. Other similarly delicate issues would be better conveyed at home, first by knowledgeable non-Americans and then by Americans.

Naturally all this would require close communication between these instructors and the instructors who will further "orient" the students on their arrival on the American campus. There should be a serious attempt to found and extend binational mechanisms of student orientation both at home and in America (see Bennett and Mason; Shao). Perhaps this could be done by extension of the regional offices of the Institute of International Education. To provide a corps of binational advisers for foreign students, the services of foreign alumni, foreign nationals with American experience, and American nationals with foreign experience should be secured.

*3. Orientation in the United States.* Orientation for American life should continue on the American campus, both by American instructors and by resident or visiting foreign instructors who have acquired a positive attitude from their valuable American experience. Such orienta-

tion should proceed under the guidance of a trained foreign student adviser. Indeed, no American institution should admit foreign students unless it can provide such an adviser on a full-time basis, with appropriate support and resources. The implicit corollary to this is that the foreign student population should number *at least* 20 or 25. Bluntly stated, to justify having foreign students and do an adequate job with them the college should admit either this number or none at all. Perhaps this requirement should be legislated.

All orientation sessions should scrupulously avoid anything that would tend, in itself, to "Americanize" the foreign student.

Periodic discussion sessions between student and adviser should occur as an ongoing development of the orientation process, coupled with academic program planning for and by the student.

4. *Deployment and Accommodation of Foreign Undergraduates.* As much as possible foreign students intent on pursuing the bachelor's degree should come to the United States with the understanding that they will attend *at least two* American colleges and/or universities in different regions of the country. At least one of the institutions should be in a large urban center and another in a rural or quasi-rural setting; an experience in both a large and small institution should be planned. This diversity of experience should offset the risk of alienation growing out of segregation in the larger institutions.[7] The above-mentioned orientation functions should recur formally within each of these locations from time to time, with sufficient frequency to be helpful, without being paternalistic or intrusive upon privacy.

The students should ordinarily spend two years in each kind of institution. Further academic and geographic experimental broadening could occur during the winter terms, for students being accommodated in the 400 to 500 colleges using the 4-1-4 calendar. They could participate in the same winter term student exchanges that are so attractive to many American students. Summer school attendance at least twice in different colleges and universities, in diverse regions of the country, could be encouraged and facilitated. Work-study could,

7. Clearly this idea is likely to be most practicable in the liberal arts, humanities, and social sciences. It is much more difficult to envisage for students in undergraduate professional programs such as engineering, nursing, and pharmacy.

of course, be a very valid dimension of any of these diverse educational experiences.

This mobility of foreign students within the United States should cultivate in them a transregional viewpoint and overcome any tendencies to acquire narrow or monolithic views of Americans or American culture.

I propose that if foreign students can bring with them the finances for four years of American education, the United States government should be willing to finance their winter term or summer school study and the cost of travel between those institutions and the two major campuses of study.

No matter where their accommodation, foreign students should not be placed in a situation in which they can segregate themselves and avoid speaking English. They should either have American roommates and live on the campus, or they should live with selected American families, somewhat in the fashion of the American Friends Service and Rotary International student programs.

Methods must be found to discourage foreign students from attending mediocre institutions and those that preach or espouse any specific social or religious doctrine as a requirement of their academic programs. Perhaps the regional accrediting agencies could identify schools whose standards of impartiality and resources qualify them as suitable for admission of foreign students.

After a sufficient period of time in the United States—say, half a year—the foreign student should, with the cooperation of the foreign student adviser, draft educational plans for the remainder of his stay in America. This would set in motion all the technical arrangements necessary for intercollege transfer (whether for winter term, summer school, or a more permanent attendance) and would identify the school that would confer the degree. It would also facilitate the attendant financial and housing arrangements, exchange of transcripts, etc.

To avoid alienation from the student's homeland, at least one (preferably two) opportunity to return home for at least two months should be provided within the span of the bachelor's degree program. Funding for this must be the responsibility of the student, but, ideally, foreign governments should guarantee the necessary financial re-

sources. One easy method would be to offer special student rates on their national airlines.

### *New Dimensions*

*1. Short-Term Stays.* Attention has focused on the foreign student who comes here to pursue the bachelor's degree. Because of both the American degree system and foreign belief in the desirability of attaining degrees, students have naturally been faced with a sort of degree-or-nothing situation. However, we should extend our approach to foreign student exchange by encouraging more one-year or two-year stays in American colleges by students from foreign universities. For this purpose a system of sister-brother relationships could be developed between American and foreign educational institutions (see Johnson, G. A.).

Moreover, American universities should attempt to accommodate a new class of students who do not quite fit either the American undergraduate or graduate academic classification. Specifically, more graduates of foreign universities who do not wish to pursue graduate degrees either in America or at home should be encouraged to spend one postgraduate year in America to pursue a certificate program[8] in some field of study that will enhance their educational breadth. The foreign student advisers could assist such students to "package" a selection of courses or individual study assignments from the available offerings, so as to qualify for certificates in self-defined areas such as American studies, electronic communications, environmental techniques, etc. Alternatively, foreign students might enroll in American universities-without-walls (UWW), either those in America or those about to be founded in foreign lands. (Significantly, Unesco and some Japanese agencies are already interested in this idea.) It is also conceivable that after, say, two years of formal study in America, a student might earn the bachelor's degree through the university-without-walls for the equivalent of the last two years. Occasional travel between America and overseas for the academic adviser and/or the student

8. Another way of viewing this is that a way is needed to break from the degree-or-nothing syndrome by establishing devices to legitimize academic stays of shorter duration (Cormack).

in such UWW arrangements would, of course, be a new dimension of educational expense which should be borne by the student and/or his government.

*2. The Foreign Alumnus of American Institutions.* We must not end our concern for the American-educated foreign student after he or she has attained the bachelor's degree. The concept of lifelong learning must also be accommodated in our ideal conceptions. Foreign students should be encouraged to return to America for the many summer institutes, alumni colleges, and continuing education opportunities that are available. These opportunities could be made known to the alumni by the foreign student adviser working with the alumni office.

A variant of this idea would allow the bachelor's degree holder to later pursue an American graduate degree through the UWW and the Union Graduate School.

*3. Graduate-Undergraduate Alumni Relations.* Another necessary dimension of the ideal would be the cultivation of a proper relationship between the foreign student whose terminal degree is the bachelor's and those of his countrymen who attain master's and doctoral degrees in America. This relationship must be established and cultivated both before and after the mutual American educational experiences.

*4. International Coordination, Training, and Advisement of Foreign Students.* Nearly all the specific functions mentioned above require for successful implementation a great measure of coordination. The major ingredients of such coordination would be an international framework and sufficient financial resources to both foster communication among foreign student advisers and provide for the widespread orientation and accommodation of students.

A secondary ingredient would be an international mode of training foreign student advisers and affiliated orientation counselors so as to foster uniformly high standards of mutual understanding of the principles and needs governing the attendance of foreign students at American universities and colleges. This idea would call for creation of a fine, new, international, professional group (an expanded, international NAFSA).

Third, a worldwide network should be encouraged under the auspices of an international agency to facilitate short-term exchange of students who (like our junior-year-abroad students) wish to study in

America for only one year, or for those who would come for one year to pursue a postbaccalaureate, certificate program.

Perhaps an enlarged quasi-public version of the Institute of International Education (see also Barnett and Mason) could be commissioned to do *all* of this (coordination, counseling, training, management, etc.) with public and private funds, but, it is hoped, without political intervention. Once started, the foreign student advisers could perpetuate these desirable activities by forming an International Association of Foreign Student Advisers. Such an association should publish an international journal of educational opportunities, techniques, and perspectives, funded by modest service fees after startup costs were underwritten by American and foreign governments and private foundations.

This plan also implies the founding of some national and regional centers for training foreign student advisers. The idea could also be extended to include the establishment of overseas Student-Exchange Orientation Centers, where advisers and affiliate staff would both acquire training and discharge their responsibilities to students (see Bennett and Mason). Key cities such as New Delhi, Hong Kong, Tokyo, Manila, Caracas, Rio de Janiero and Lagos would be well suited for such centers.

Ideally, from the student's standpoint, these centers should be staffed by people from the home country as well as from the United States *and* the institution to which he or she is going. The latter person will be someone to whom students can turn when they arrive at the American institution. Conversely, the institution should have available, either on campus or on call, a person from the student's native country to whom he or she can turn if a problem arises. That is, the foreign student should ideally have at least one adjunct adviser who is a fellow countryman and one American adviser. Obviously, this plan calls for a combination of more permanent staff, a corps of on-call "adjunct" staff members, and a corps of "circuit" advisers, who will travel from campus to campus on a regular basis, to advise nationals from specific countries. As mentioned, the services of foreign alumni, foreign businessmen and diplomats, and senior or graduate foreign students from other universities should be secured for these "adjunct" or "circuit" roles, with some assistance from Americans with overseas

experience in specific countries. (As a corollary to this idea, the advisers could hold periodic regional advisement conferences in central locations, to which the foreign students could go for assistance and advice.) Within this framework special new advisement approaches should be introduced to prepare students for return to their homeland.

In summary, all selection, assignment, orientation, and advisement mechanisms should be binational and individualized as much as possible. These functions should be supervised by a corps of formally trained professionals.

*5. Curricular Revision.* The obvious benefits of foreign student exchange for Americans and foreigners alike, together with the common problems that are shared by so many countries, lead us to believe there should be a concentrated commitment and effort to make international and intercultural studies an integral part of the basic undergraduate curriculums of American colleges and universities. That is, our students should have a sustained confrontation with a different cultural group (Richardson, p. 17). Specifically, efforts should be made to involve foreign students in the teaching of international and intercultural studies, so that their viewpoints can be made part of the total American educational stream (e.g., foreign students could serve as part-time assistants in language laboratories). Moreover, at least one year's study in a foreign university would be ideal experience for all American undergraduates. In this context the old emphasis on Europe must be better balanced by opportunities in Asia and elsewhere. In short, the curriculum should be redesigned to specifically put into practice the articulated institutional goals, principles, and purposes that justify international student exchange. Revised curriculums must include program dimensions that will help the foreign student to preserve his or her own cultural integrity.

*6. Training the American Professoriat.* If the training of foreign student advisers and of a binational corps of affiliate counselors is of paramount importance, a major concomitant task should be to provide opportunities for American professors to acquire training in the proper modes of teaching and accommodating foreign students (see Richardson, p. 19). This could be done in a series of workshop sessions offered by the foreign student advisory centers, both in the United States and overseas.

7. *Emergency Financial Subsidies.* Given the short period of time available for study in the United States it would be desirable to at least have available subsidies to supplement the personal financial resources brought by foreign students (as required for the F1 visa) in amounts sufficient to obviate any emergency economic necessity for the foreign student to take up part-time employment in America. These subsidies could be drawn from a pool provided by foreign and domestic government and private agencies.

8. *The Pan-National College Concept.* A novel and productive compromise between higher education experience in one's native land and in America is manifest in the pan-national college.

A unique example of this concept is Covell College, one of the undergraduate cluster colleges at the University of the Pacific (see Caldwell). The unifying theme in Covell College is pan-Americanism. Through an active recruiting program, students come from virtually all the Latin American countries. Thus half of the students in Covell College are native speakers of Spanish; the others are Americans. The Spanish-speaking students acquire facility with English as a second language, and the Americans do the same with Spanish.

The curriculum is essentially an American-style offering except that it is taught in Spanish and does provide a pan-American perspective on political science, sociology, American history, etc. Chauvinism and political advocacy are scrupulously avoided. Students who wish to broaden their educational experience beyond the offerings of Covell College itself can also undertake numerous studies in several of the other schools and colleges of the university. (In fact, they *must* take *at least* one course per semester in the other English-speaking colleges of the university.) The Covell College degree requires that at least half the accumulated credits for graduation must be acquired in courses that are taught in the Spanish language. (As an example, even chemistry and geology are taught in Spanish.)

In this unique setting the problem of segregation of foreign students is balanced by the fact that the American students in such an academic environment are also "foreign" students, insofar as they are learning in a foreign language. Thus a compromise is struck through providing a common experience in America that is both foreign and domestic for all participants. The process is fostered by the fact that many of

the faculty are native-born speakers of Spanish. Also, visiting professors from foreign embassies and universities add leavening to the pan-nationalism of the curriculum.

The pan-American theme of Covell College naturally facilitates understanding and good will among these students from several Latin countries. Indeed, they acquire a far broader international understanding in this setting than is possible by simple student exchange between any two countries. In the entire process no student loses his native identity.

Pan-national colleges, in which English, French, or Russian is the common language, could be founded in many countries of the world, as well as the United States. Perhaps the United Nations could be the vehicle for beginning such a movement.

Existing universities and colleges can found such cluster colleges either *de novo* or by regrouping and redeployment of existing colleges and departments. Thus the cost of attaining such a new dimension of undergraduate education can be quite modest. The cluster colleges embody an atmosphere of warm responsibility for the general welfare of their students, which is good for American and foreigner alike. Corollary facilities such as pan-national dining halls and residence halls are equally easy to create from established resources, once the college commits itself to a theme and new international identity.

Covell College is one of the best conceived and functioning models of the kind of ideal program I have sought in preparing this paper.

*9. Integrated International Programs on Campus.* From the college's viewpoint, the ideal accommodation of foreign students must properly be dealt with as part of a coordinated program of international study including all of the following (see Richardson):

- Foreign students
- Curriculum reform and enrichment
- Faculty development (training and enrichment)
- Visiting scholars
- Overseas experience for American students
- Special international and intercultural programs

Ideally, this kind of coordinated approach should be encouraged and facilitated worldwide, but only among institutions that have both the resources and commitment to do the job properly.

*10. Uniform Academic Standards.* Finally, and above all, I urge the pursuit of uniformly high academic standards for *both* American and foreign undergraduates. Particularly, we must strive to avoid double standards that demoralize Americans and foreigners alike, although for different reasons. In the end it is the quality of our educational enterprise that will secure a position of great distinction in world history.

## Summary of Recommendations

1. New laws are needed to favor the national educational interest by means of foreign student exchange (see Laws and Regulations pp. 6, 7).

2. Worldwide efforts should be made through the proposed International Association of Foreign Student Affairs to cultivate and publicize the value, importance, and success of the foreign student exchange program for the United States and other nations.

3. Foreign students should be more carefully selected before admission to the United States according to such factors (beyond ability in English) as devotion to their own national cultural heritage, place in the social structure in their own country, extraordinary talents (e.g., musicianship).

4. All foreign undergraduate students once admitted to American colleges and universities should be accorded at least the same measure of equality as enjoyed by American students (e.g., eligibility for emergency loans, student health care). Moreover, some actual subsidy should be made available to foreign students in financial emergencies.

5. We should limit the number of undergraduate foreign students who come to the United States to pursue bachelor's degrees in professional fields (e.g., engineering, pharmacy). Whether or not such degree opportunities are lacking at home, the students should ideally pursue a liberal arts and science undergraduate degree in their homelands or in the United States, before undertaking specialized professional work at the graduate level in the United States.

6. No college or university should admit fewer than 20 foreign students. One full-time foreign student adviser should be provided for every 20 foreign students.

7. Colleges and universities aspiring to accept foreign students should meet minimum requirements (e.g., number 6 above) as specified by a national screening board. Instead of the present "laissez-faire" situation, which allows virtually any college to admit foreign students, a *system* of screening colleges for academic suitability for foreign student accommodation should be set up. Theoretically this might be done by a joint board of standards made up of representatives from (1) the proposed International Association of Foreign Student Affairs and (2) the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education; together with token representation from (3) the American Council on Education, (4) the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and (5) the Office of the Secretary of the Department of State. Methods must be found to discourage foreign undergraduates from attending mediocre institutions and/or those that preach specific social or religious doctrines as academic requirements.

8. Foreign students should be prepared at home for their American educational experiences by binational orientation teams in which both their countrymen and American counselors play a part. To do this, binational regional student-exchange orientation centers should be established in as many foreign countries as possible. Both the training of advisers and the actual counseling of students should occur at such centers.

9. Once in the United States the student should receive further binational counsel by an American foreign student adviser and fellow-countryman-adviser. Institutions need a combination of permanent staff advisers and a corps of adjunct and "circuit" advisers to foreign students.

10. After half a year in the United States the foreign student, with the cooperation of the foreign student adviser, should draft an educational plan for the remainder of his or her education in the United States. This can be reviewed periodically and revised as the student progresses toward the bachelor's degree.

11. Foreign students in pursuit of bachelor's degrees should be required to attend at least two American colleges or universities; one large and one small, one in an urban and one in a rural setting, and in different regions of the country. Two years should be spent in each in-

stitution. Student travel in the United States should also be encouraged. Subsidy of travel between the two major institutions of study should be underwritten by the American government.

12. To avoid alienation from their homeland, foreign students should be encouraged and/or provided the means to return home at least once, preferably twice, during pursuit of the bachelor's degree.

13. New and distinctive advisement efforts should be introduced to orient and prepare the student for return to his homeland. Special efforts should be made to cultivate a congenial relationship between the bachelor's degree students and their fellow countrymen who attain master's and doctoral degrees in the United States.

14. In keeping with the concept of lifelong learning, encouragement and means should be provided to enable foreign alumni to return to the United States on a regular basis (say, every five years) to reinforce and update their American educational experience. Foreign governments should cooperate in this effort. As a less expensive corollary to this means of intellectual reinforcement, means should be provided for foreign alumni to maintain memberships in (and receive the journals of) American professional associations.

15. We should extend our approach to foreign student exchange by departing from the "degree-or-nothing" syndrome and encouraging (and thereby legitimizing) more one- or two-year educational stays in America. Opportunities should be provided for such persons to complete American degrees at home through universities-without-walls plans.

16. The development should be encouraged of a new class of foreign students who will pursue post-bachelor's and pre-master's certificate programs in self-defined programs within fields of study that will enhance their educational breadth (e.g., American studies, electronic communication, environmental techniques).

17. American colleges and universities that want to admit foreign students should make a strong and active commitment to establish international and intercultural studies as an integral part of their undergraduate curriculums. Foreign students should both contribute to and receive from such programs. Further, such institutions should accommodate foreign students as part of a university international

*program* which also includes visiting scholars, curricular reform, faculty training, etc.

18. To provide for constant training of a new international corps of professional foreign student advisers, and to provide international coordination of the student exchange center activities (including student exchange itself), a new International Association of Foreign Students' Affairs should be founded. Finances for this enterprise can be had largely by pooling existing financial resources (already committed to these kinds of activities at many institutions) under the management of a new quasi-public international agency or consortium for student exchange.

19. Efforts should be made to foster the founding of binational colleges among and within the existing colleges and universities of the United States. Such colleges alleviate many of the alienating factors that have hindered fulfillment of the ideals of international student exchange for both American and foreign students.

20. Above all, we must strive to avoid, in any foreign student exchange plan, double or multiple academic standards that demoralize American and foreign students alike. Uniformly high academic standards should be the universal rule.

## References

Barnett, V. M., and Mason, E. S., *The Overseas Selection of Foreign Students: Education and World Affairs Report*, 1966, 29 pp.

Bayer, A. E., "Foreign Students in American Colleges: Time for Change in Policy and Practice," *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 1, 1973, pp. 389-400.

Bozeman, A. B., "Do Educational and Cultural Exchanges Have Political Relevance?" *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, Fall 1969.

Caldwell, G., "Ulysses as a University Student; the Foreign Student in the United States," Mexico City, 1974, Revista del Centro de Estudios Educativos.

Cormack, M. (Professor of Intercultural Studies, Callison College, University of the Pacific), in a personal communication, 1974.

Dremuk, R., "Will We Be Admitting Foreign Students in 1975?" *Journal of Associated College Admissions Counselors*, Vol. 11, No. 4, (1966), pp. 4-8.

Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs, Report from Federation of Regional Accrediting Commission of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1972, 18 pp.

Johnson, A. W., "Costs of International Education: Who Pays?" *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, Spring 1971, pp. 32-41.

Johnson, D. C., "Problems of Foreign Students," *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, Fall 1971.

Johnson, G. A., "Foreign Student Admissions: Another Approach," *Journal of Associated College Admissions Counselors*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (1966), p. 3.

Laws and Regulations Governing International Student Exchange, Position Paper, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1973, p. 7.

Lewis, J. J. (chairman), "The International Student Speaks: My Admission in Retrospect," report of discussion session, *College and University*, Summer 1971, pp. 509-512.

Matteson, R. E., *The USAID Participant Training Program*, Report of AACRAO-AID Conference on "University–Government Cooperation in Programs for Students from Abroad," Washington, D.C., 1970, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

*Open Doors*, Report on International Exchange, New York, 1973, Institute of International Education, 65 pp.

Opstad, Paul, *et al.*, *Foreign Student Programs: A Progress Report and Recommendations*, California State Colleges, I.R.S.A. Project 3-64-2, July 1965.

Richardson, B., "International Studies for Undergraduates" *Council for Advancement of Small Colleges – Newsletter*, Washington, D.C., January 1974, pp. 19-20.

Shao, O. H., "Foreign Students To and Fro", *Challenges of Change to the Christian College*, Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. 29-36.

Shearer, B. L., "Is Your Institution Really Ready to Admit Foreign Students?" *College and University*, Summer 1973, pp. 611-618.

Spogren, C., "Is Your Institution Really Ready to Admit Foreign Students?" *College and University*, Summer 1973, pp. 601-611.

Walton, B. J., "Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective," U.S. Department of State Publication 8373, 1967. 59 pp.

Wilcox, L., "A Plan for Institutional–National Foreign Student Admissions Research," *College and University*, Summer 1973, pp. 623-630.

## Responses to the Paper

Colloquium participants met in four groups to consider each of the papers presented. The discussion in Group I was coordinated by E. E. Oliver, Group II James Frey, Group III Dante Scalzi, Group IV Eugene Clubine. The chairman of the first general discussion period, Albert Sims, called for reports from the four discussion groups, to be followed by his remarks and a general colloquy.

### *Reports from the Discussion Groups*

*Group I.* William Patrick observed that for Group I, McCrone's blue-sky treatment of the pragmatic problems encountered in international education had provided some thought-provoking recommendations. However, the consensus was that in many aspects the paper had an air of unreality about it, since many existing factors weighed heavily against implementing some of the recommendations. Examples are: the suggested screening of institutions that admit foreign students (who is to do it, by what standards, who establishes the standards, how would they be enforced) and the call for additional funding at a time when many institutions are hard pressed or even closing their doors.

Members of the group pointed out that many topics in the paper had been of concern for 10 or 15 years. The American concept of universal higher educational opportunity is spreading to other countries—Germany and the United Kingdom, among others. International education cannot really be looked at apart from the whole scheme of American higher education; greater emphasis needs to be placed on where it is today and where it ought to be headed in the future. The emergence and growth of community colleges are significant.

Also discussed were problems affecting higher education today: the disrepair of higher education, especially general education; disillusionment among the American public and among legislators in many states; and the acute realities of financial support.

Among students, it was pointed out, there appears to be a return to competition for grades and for entry into graduate and professional schools—especially medicine, dentistry, and law—indicating

that they expect their education to give them entry into a career. But we are already producing so many graduates that the employment market cannot absorb them. This problem is also acute in many foreign countries. The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) has a program currently to assist foreign students to obtain employment overseas. The role of education is changing in an attempt to cope with sociological, economic, and political changes. We might have an entirely different configuration of foreign students in the years ahead, with new sources in the Middle East and in Africa, notably the newly released colonies of Portugal.

While there have been some bad aspects of international education, the payoff in good aspects can be documented and has been significant. The concept of international education as essentially beneficial has to be sold to the general public and to politicians and businessmen in influential positions. So many needs are not being met in higher education for our own American students that there is resistance to efforts to sequester resources or gain additional support for international education. We must come up with very significant reasons why international education is so important.

The suggestion of a new international organization for foreign student affairs was not supported, since it could do little that NAFSA can't already do now or through expansion.

Alumni organizations in the past have related primarily to undergraduate students. There must be greater emphasis on programs viable for graduate students and calling on the alumni for support of the whole work of international education.

The group consensus held that the new immigration regulations would slow the flow of students to the United States. This might lead to elitism, taking us back to the days when only the very rich could afford to send their children here. Concern was expressed that as a result this country might not be able to help many of the emerging nations.

It seems that very few institutions in the nation have really evaluated their international education commitment: their philosophy for having foreign students on campus; their academic programs, facilities, or services. There is a definite need for a system to monitor these activities, as in the beginnings of the NAFSA Field Service Program.

The "big brother" approach of large institutions working with smaller ones in the same geographical area was praised, as was the idea of linking up of all related resources—not only the faculty and students but also the international organizations such as the Institute of International Education and many others. The whole area of communications continues to be a tremendous problem, reciprocated by the dramatically bad experiences of many American students going abroad, possibly because of faulty concepts by foreign student advisers and services in other countries.

The group gave little support to the proposed national, centralized admissions and placement operation, distrusting in grand solutions to day-to-day pragmatic problems. Very often this merely creates a tremendous but ineffective bureaucracy. Perhaps we need a good "traffic cop" to steer people in the right direction, to prevent that unfortunate situation whereby a great many students end up at the wrong institutions, enrolled in the wrong programs.

The group felt that we do need a holistic view. The institutions should review and assess their own international education programs and organization, with a view toward dealing with the needs of the student. We need greater interaction and participation to provide leadership as well as better, more concise information and guidance to each other, to the general public, and to state and federal agencies. We particularly need to make a special effort to advise the federal government on what should be done to support international education.

Finally, the group strongly recommended more viable regional organizations, much greater emphasis on the functional aspects of international organization, and greater cohesiveness and effectiveness in the whole array of international education activities and programs.

* * *

*Group II.* Ross Alm summarized Group II's discussion as centering around five distinct areas. First, the members felt that a binational college was opposed to other concepts proposed by McCrone. Was it good for the foreign student? It might be a fine experience for the American studying Asia, but the reverse was not necessarily true. Could we in this way assimilate the individual from a foreign country totally into American education, or would we be creating our own

ghetto? A possible compromise suggested was that students might enter a binational college at a very high level of foreign-language capability and usage—say, in all except one course. By the time they were in their senior year they would be involved in a totally English-language learning process, with perhaps only a single course in their own native language. A second question concerning the pan-national college was whether there could be any kind of interaction among other nationalities. Could an institution enrolling Africans, Middle Easterners, and Far Easterners get them to interact with one another? Putting many nationalities into one college didn't seem to be a workable solution.

Second, Group II was concerned with McCrone's admonition not to allow foreign undergraduates to get a mediocre education. Who is going to decide what is mediocre? An unaccredited institution? One that's going under financially? We can't decide that. Let someone propose, "All you people from mediocre institutions now stand up," and at that point everybody sits down.

A third concern was the impact on a foreign student of the treatment he or she receives at a given college. In many cases the student has come to the one college that accepted his or her application and doesn't really have a wide range of choices. Probably the reason many students come here is that they could not get into college at home, but that's not the reason the American student goes abroad. Someone pointed out that maybe a foreign student who is the only one in an institution might get far better treatment without an adviser of any kind than would 20 students with an adviser. In the past, with none of the foreign student adviser programs we have today, many ex-students retained over the years a very close contact with the institution they had attended. As for the inadvisability of creating a "ghetto," it was suggested that maybe the only way some students can relax and preserve their sanity is to "cook curry and talk their native language." If foreign students need the release of getting together with other people of their own group who understand them, we should not try to take it away from them. It was also suggested that students have resiliency and can cope with more than we think. The first year is crucial, because what they're doing seems totally foreign to anything they have done and they wonder why they're

doing it. Advice is needed at this time.

Fourth, the group was reminded that the social structure of the student's home area is important. Elitism may be ingrained into the society and the political structure; and outsiders who dig under that structure may not be appreciated. We can't affect conditions in the home country from here, yet much of what we do relies on something happening in the country—identification of students to educate, policy matters.

Next, the group examined Joseph Jacobsen's presentation of the two-year, vocational-technical, nontransfer program at the City College of San Francisco, which denies admission unless this length of stay is agreed to.[1] In this context, it was felt that study is needed on the question of how long the foreign undergraduate student ought to

---

1. A statement concerning technical programs at community colleges was presented by Jacobsen and served as the basis for extensive discussion in several sessions of the colloquium.

A. Concerted efforts should be made to increase the number of organized programs by government, foundations, and industry which can enable growing numbers of foreign students to avail themselves of the technical programs offered by our community colleges.

B. Community colleges with a desirable selection of technical occupational two-year majors, a limiting quota of foreign students, and with four-year colleges in the area should consider giving the highest priority to admission of "F" visa students interested in technical two-year majors, and their academic programs should be largely restricted to the required or suggested courses in those majors so that:

1. Students will not be tempted to extend their stay by transferring to four-year colleges, since they will not have studied the lower-division courses required in four-year majors.

2. There will be less chance of their running out of money during the relatively short time required to complete a technical major.

3. The international education program of a community college will not become a clandestine route for immigration.

4. Foreign countries can receive the services of much-needed technical workers.

5. Community colleges will not be competing for foreign students with four-year colleges, when two-year and four-year colleges are in close proximity.

6. An overseas education program requiring less expenditure of money and with less sophisticated and rigid prerequisites will be available for other than the elite.

7. Practical training for college credit frequently is possible in local business or industry during the school year, during summer vacation, or at the completion of the academic training.

be in this country. Some members suggested that a foreign liberal arts student should come out of a four-year program with a usable skill in addition to the liberal arts degree.

Finally, a number of questions were posed for which the group found no satisfactory answers. Are students alienated as they come through the system, or are they happy with their American experience, as many report? How many fail to graduate, and how many fail because they didn't like the situation or found themselves ending up, as Patrick said, in the wrong institutions in the wrong programs? No reliable data are available.

The objective of the international student coming to the United States is experience and education leading to a degree. The final question to answer is whether our goals for international education fit the goals of the students who are coming to us.

* * *

*Group III.* Thomas Diener reported a feeling in Group III that there is a lack of commitment to international education on the part of American institutions. The discussion brought out the fact that commitment cannot be assayed solely on the basis of an institution's claim that "we espouse international education." Conversely, an institution may be strongly committed through its individual departmental activity, even though it has no stated policy and no obvious trappings such as a full-time staff devoted to foreign student affairs.

Second, the group thought that the question of priorities for the foreign student should be viewed in the context of other priorities, both in higher education and in United States society at large—priorities that affect not only the student but also his government and the interests of the American institution and American society. The group discussed the problem of accepting foreign students on an equal footing with students from our own culture. In accepting them as equals a paradox is created when they are furnished with the needed support programs, because of the implication that foreign students are different and not equal.

There was debate on the question of whether foreign students at community colleges should be allowed into transfer programs or be limited solely to two-year career programs. Some thought that the community college could play the largest and most helpful role in

receiving vocational-technical students and would also benefit the most, since the foreign students' presence would have a more pronounced effect in these small communities and bring about a "deparochialization" of the student bodies. The group also gave considerable time to debating whether the foreign government involved profits from the limiting of its students to a two-year career program. Many felt that sending students abroad to study career programs brings the most immediate benefits to a developing country, but it was also suggested that the student's home institutions are thwarted when such training is carried on solely in this country. There was discussion of whether students in both four-year programs and two-year career programs should be channeled primarily through the "best," the "mediocre," or the two-year colleges.

It was agreed that the proposed pan-national college, if at all feasible, is not the single answer to the problems of international education.

Regarding the question of foundation support, the group felt that foundations and funding agencies will actively support international education once an institution has shown an interest in it and has identified its priority.

* * *

*Group IV.* The Reverend Edmund Ryan reported on Group IV's discussion, which began with an attempt to define the ideal of American education in general: to aid the individual to fulfill his own potentialities and in so doing to raise the individual's quality of life and the quality of life and the level of culture of the nation. There was some debate on whether or not this is a valid ideal for the United States and whether it is a valid ideal for the rest of the world. Similarly, the ideal for *foreign* students' education in the United States is that their experiences should lead to the greatest development of an individual student's potential. To insure this development we need advisement in the foreign country before the student comes to the United States to get a good match or link between the student and the institution. Then we need advisement in the United States about the relevance of a student's own program and about when or if the student should return home. (While we don't encourage the brain drain, it might be in the best interest of the student's full realization

of potential to tell him or her to stay in the United States.) It might be beneficial to a student to experience a variety of educational settings: small and large colleges, urban and rural. In addition to formal educational experiences (classroom, laboratory, and work experience) informal experiences are a very important dimension—such things as give-and-take discussions among students, visiting American families, off-campus trips to shops and museums.

A second consideration is: What type of foreign student comes to this country for an education? Are we speaking of an elite or a meritocracy? The group believed philosophically that we should *not* favor an elite based on personal wealth or birth, yet was realistic enough to note that the system today is self-selective—that this kind of student is coming to the United States and has been coming for some time. The question is: Should we hold out to the young people in foreign countries the same ideal that we have in the United States: that all people should have the opportunity to be educated to the full extent of their potentialities? Of course, this is just one model, the United States model.

Consideration was given to the various reasons for educating foreign students in the United States. From the viewpoint of international education agencies and the United States government, the foreign students in the United States are people who will become interested in and will understand the culture and history and spirit of this country and will be future leaders in their own countries. A new policy of the Agency for International Development was mentioned, whereby AID will pay the expenses of a doctoral student to return to his or her home country to do research there (so that the research project will be of service to that country) and the expenses involved in coming back to take oral exams and complete the doctorate program here. Perhaps we should have a similar program on the undergraduate level. Next, in the view of the United States college or university, many see the presence of foreign students as very important for the education of our own American undergraduates in preparing young people for the world of the twentieth and the twenty-first centuries. As for the foreign nation that sends its students, many see the enrollment of students in the United States as advantageous because of the technical help that they will bring back to their own

country. And many look at it as a very important move toward bringing about international understanding. The motives of individual students are quite varied—among them are a wish to develop their own potentialities to the fullest and a knowledge that study abroad gives them a certain ladder to success in their home countries. The group recognized in the debate that there are tensions among what is best for the individual, the United States, and the foreign nation.

Group IV agreed with most of McCrone's specific recommendations but had reservations about several. The group did not endorse the third recommendation, the question of limiting students matriculating in the United States to those who want to pursue bachelor's work in professional subjects. It was considered too restrictive and self-defeating. The sixth recommendation, the adviser for every 20 students, would be too expensive. (McCrone said he included it mainly to provoke discussion.) On the seventh recommendation the group agreed that there should be some way of advising people before they come to the United States of the type and quality of the institution to which they are seeking admission. It was suggested that regional accrediting associations might ask: "Should this institution be recommended to foreign students?" The association would consider whether the institution is ready to receive foreign students and if it advises them properly, but would not base accreditation on its answer. The group generally questioned the wisdom of the eleventh recommendation: that foreign students should study at two different types of campuses during their matriculation as undergraduates. If this worked to the disadvantage of the academic program, the group would not be in favor of it. However, this type of experience could be gained through vacation travel while in the United States, through a plan of continuing education in which the individual would return to the United States, or by spending, say, a winter term at another campus. In any case we would want consideration of the best interests of the individual student. The nineteenth recommendation, the binational college, is admittedly an experiment that seems to be working, but the group noted that it is very expensive and also that it tends to set up a ghetto—a concept we discourage when we send American students to foreign countries for a junior year abroad.

At the conclusion of the group reports Albert Sims, rather than summarize those reports, offered his commentary on international education. The basic problems reflect some things that are happening in the mainstream of education in the United States and around the world. To the extent that we address these problems as problems peculiar to international education we, who have specialized interests in international education, end up talking to and among ourselves. Therefore our discussions are without much effective influence.

Some of the enormous changes in process now are the following: The values of higher education have come into question and challenge in the United States. Money for education is harder to come by. Legislation is enacted with greater difficulty and less generosity. A new emphasis on accountability is evident in the concern of the general public about what happens with the increasing investment in higher education that they make for their children, and why many students are coming out of institutions seemingly untrained, without the skills to command high-paying jobs commensurate with the investment. An attempt to break the lockstep of higher education is evident in the growth of nontraditional studies and independent study. A noticeable trend toward vocationalism is seen in the growing competition for admission to professional schools, in growing enrollment in community colleges, and in the rapid growth of private enterprise, profit-making ventures in postsecondary education—the proprietary institutions. Students themselves are also beginning to demand, "What are we going to get out of it?" They want assurances that their investment of time and money is going to pay off. All these factors point to a new form of higher education that is sometimes called career education—an attempt to link more closely the educational process with occupational prospects.

Of course, these trends are not massively characteristic of higher education right now, but they are having an immense progressive influence on education's style.

It is evident now as enrollment declines in some institutions of higher education that we must look to other markets for students. This necessity ties in with the notion that education is a lifelong

process and that postsecondary education ought to be available to adults to move into and out of freely in the course of their lifetime. In the future the two-year and the four-year educational programs may not be the exclusive environment of adolescents and young and maturing men and women but will be styled to attract and satisfy adult students as they move in and out.

Another important factor is that both public and private institutions (but mostly private) are finding it harder to survive financially and, consequently, must have a reckoning of values and priorities. International education, to survive in that climate, has got to be presented to institutions, presidents, and boards of trustees as relevant, attractive, and necessary for their survival. So, rather than just talking to one another, we must try to become effectively influential in the processes of policy development at the institutional level (that's our primary concern at this colloquium) and also at the governmental level and in terms of overall educational policy. McCrone's paper, while it touched on aspects of this, gave more weight to institutional activities and programs.

It is important to talk about the processes involved in international education and not just the movement of students. A good international education program involves movement of faculty, the organization of community resources, linkages with private agencies and foundations, and cooperative efforts with our counterpart communities abroad. There must be sophisticated faculty who know the international education scene here and abroad. There must be interested people in the community, participation of business and industry, support from government, and a continuous process of communications from us to the areas abroad with which we relate. Vigorous initiatives are required.

### *General Colloquium Discussion*

As the general discussion period began Alistair McCrone commented briefly on several points in his paper that had received particular attention in the groups. Group II had questioned whether the pannational college would be a good thing for the foreign students involved, and McCrone emphasized that he had seen it work very well for foreign students at Covell College, University of the Pacific, and would consider it beyond the experimental stage. He conceded that

it is fairly expensive but reminded the group that cluster colleges in general are fairly expensive—this one no more than others. The greatest expense has been the financial subsidy of Latin American students. He also felt that the pan-national college would work as well at a small university as it has worked in a large one (a college of 200 students within a university of 4,000).

McCrone stated that the extent of the screening process he had in mind would be for regional accrediting associations to judge during the regular accreditation process whether an institution is suitable for foreign students.

The conceptions of the ideal McCrone presented may only be valuable in the immediate future because of imminent changes in the educational structure of such countries as Iran, which sends about 15,000 Iranian students here now and has between 40,000 and 50,000 in Iranian universities. So our enormous impact may last for a year or two more and then the proportions may change. Then new ideals may have to be substituted.

The great strength of American society has come from the country's role as a melting pot; intellects of many nations have come into confluence here. Now that the massive immigration is over, how are we going to continue this great mixing of ideas and intellects if not through international student exchange—the one avenue open to us now to keep our society vital and our intellectual advancement buoyant.

Several issues were brought up during the discussion that followed, led by Albert Sims. First among these was the question whether we are doing the job well at present. One view was that we must be, because students continue to come in increasing numbers. Others felt strongly that this was no guarantee that students were being well served, and they questioned who exactly is it who comes. If these students are from the developing countries, are they the elite of those nations or the masses? Another aspect of the question was: How can we tell what sort of job we're doing? Do we have sufficient follow-up information? There was also some discussion of the question: If we are doing our job well, who is the "we" who is doing the job? Some members interpreted this as meaning "the American higher education community," but others felt that those of us who are involved in the

care of just foreign students on our campuses can attest to the fact that we are doing the job by and large. There is no wish to detract from the efforts of dedicated professors, some administrators, and the people in foundations and agencies, because their involvement in international education has been long-lived and extremely valuable. But the one person who knows best how things are for foreign students at institutions is the foreign student adviser because he or she is most deeply involved. It was suggested that sometimes, even if the foreign student is well served, there may be a failure to maximize the foreign student as a campus resource for both academic and social experiences, so that the purposes of the American student are not being well served.

One participant pointed out that many times the foreign students who are sponsored to come to America, especially from developing nations, are young people from families that can afford to send them abroad to study. If we continue to view the education of the elite as the only avenue of international education we are not furthering what many consider the ultimate goal of education. In many developing nations the structure of education is failing miserably because the educated elite and the vast masses of people cannot relate to each other, as there are no linkages between the two. Will American institutions offer these different kinds of students, as they come, an education that will help them to function in societies that have diverse people and problems?

Granted the scarcity of objective data, most of us have experienced first hand the results of inappropriate selection—that is, we've talked to a student who is obviously at the wrong school, who has been admitted with totally inadequate preparation, or knowledge of English, or finances. And the suggestion was made that one workable ideal would be to maximize the experience of every foreign student in line with developing his or her potential as far as it can go, whether that means a terminal degree in a community college or a Ph.D. Good counseling and good program planning are essential to discover the student's potential; then the resources have to be mustered to provide him or her with the best possible experience.

In line with this, it was noted that the movements of adults in and out of higher education in the United States and the discontinuities

that younger people have with their educational experiences will put more emphasis on educational achievement in terms of knowledge and skills than upon degrees. The important thing is, "What can I do with what I know?" not, "What degree do I have?" And this is even more relevant in developing countries. The difficulties of the above sort of educational planning were mentioned, and the fact was noted that career advisement is abysmally lacking in higher education institutions. Most institutions are not well equipped to work with students—both American and certainly foreign students—in the decision making that involves their careers. Furthermore, it was noted that an attempt to tie postsecondary education to a manpower game causes trouble, because education can't be justified solely on that basis. Questioning the value of higher education is not peculiar to America. It was generally agreed that we should be concerned about the relationship between occupations and education, but that it should not be the sole concern.

Regarding the question of educating the public and talking to legislators about what is being done in international education, it was suggested, too, that the accrediting associations need to question individual institutions on their foreign student programs. Institutions may not respond until the accrediting associations begin to require an institutional statement as part of its presentation. The Federation of Regional Accrediting Councils on Higher Education has been exploring this issue and has made some progress.

A discussion of the rising importance of proprietary schools concluded the session. Many of these have no particular institutional commitment to international education, no foreign student advisers, and little concern about evaluating credentials, yet they are admitting great numbers of foreign students. Some members were concerned that, unfortunately, in conferences such as this one, proprietary schools seem often to be absent from the dialogs among more traditional institutions and agencies. If representatives of these schools were included they might very likely be impressed with the concern that all of us manifest and with our efforts to include them in our deliberations. One participant noted that it may be vastly disconcerting that the proprietary institutions, which have not benefited by the wisdom of these kinds of conferences, may prove functional in the

marketplace. In this connection, it was pointed out that some of the schools do an excellent job of career preparation – and that they have good support from the federal government.

# 3. The Now Reality

*by A. Lee Zeigler*

The writer of the previous paper has made my job easier by profiling the categories and characteristics of foreign students in this country over the past 20 years, in the context of history and relevant issues affecting their movements to our educational institutions. My assignment is to halt us momentarily in our quest of the ideal, long enough to examine the actualities of today before we incorporate them into an imaginative yet practical blueprint for the years ahead. Which means, I guess, that I'm supposed to be holding the bucket of cold water.

Before we all are soaked in a metaphoric splash, I'd like to preface my reality statements with an example of how we can always find a rationale for whatever action plan we propose. Like the financial analyst who can always find the appropriate set of statistics to prove his case, so the international educator can find a statement of support for his proposal. And we all delight in stealing from the noncopyrighted studies of our colleagues.

In 1971 Barbara Walton noted in a review of research on foreign students[1] that the percentage of graduate students among foreign scholars had increased from 35 percent in 1960 to 45 percent in 1970. She cited the following reasons for this steady growth in the proportion of foreign graduate students to foreign undergraduate students: (1) the graduate student is thought to be better able to contribute to the economic development of his home country upon his return home; (2) he is less likely to remain in the United States, since he probably has developed more strongly established roots at home than a younger undergraduate; and (3) he is probably better able to handle American collegiate study if he has completed a solid preparatory educational base at home before coming here to study for the more sophisticated final stages of his training.

Sound logical? But listen to this: In *The Foreign Student: Whom Shall*

1. *The Foreign Graduate Student: Institutional Priorities for Research and Action* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971), pages 80–98.

*We Invite?* (1964), a publication of the Education and World Affairs Study Committee on Foreign Student Affairs, it was judged that preference should be given the undergraduate foreign student because: (1) with his relative youth and less specialized academic expectations, there would seem to be a greater emphasis on social/cultural interaction with the host society by undergraduates; (2) costs of graduate education in the United States are higher; (3) resources are too limited in developing countries for those who have had their highly sophisticated and specialized training in the United States; (4) the availability of space for study at graduate or advanced levels is limited and is needed by American students; and (5) prior home country training, frequently incomparable and often inadequate, should not be judged equal to American pregraduate school study.

### *The Overall Data*

Fortunately, my role allows no editorial comments on what should be, so I'll move on to what is. Anyone who has been around this business for a while knows that we are analyzing the foreign undergraduate student today in the context of some 3,000 postsecondary institutions, public and private, each doing its own thing, and that the total foreign student enrollment in the United States, though possibly impressive in absolute numbers, represents only 1.8 percent of the total college and university enrollment in our country (8,219,691),[2] a small percentage indeed when compared with foreign student percentages in some other countries.[3] France, 5.3 percent; Canada, 7.4 percent; Austria, 15.8 percent; Belgium, 11.5 percent; Federal Republic of Germany, 5.6 percent; Switzerland, 22.5 percent; United Kingdom, 5.4 percent.

Because of the diversity of institutions and lack of collective policies, there is no way to present a truly accurate picture of the foreign undergraduate today without a survey of total outreach. *Open Doors*[4]

2. Total degree-credit enrollment, fall 1972: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education Division, *Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1972*.

3. *Unesco Statistical Yearbook, 1972*.

4. Annual report on international exchange presented by the Institute of International Education.

gives us some basic statistical information, and to supplement what Alistair McCrone has already presented, I broke down *Open Doors*'s census data on undergraduates alone on a 10-year comparative basis, citing statistics for fall 1962 and fall 1972 (the most recent census data available):

1962: total foreign students in U.S. = 64,705
undergraduates = 33,203 or 51.3 percent of the total

1972: total foreign students in U.S. = 146,097
undergraduates = 73,968 or 50.6 percent of the total

These data (see Table 1) would lead us to conclude, if we accept the *Open Doors* census figures as the most complete available to us, that (Barbara Walton's statement about graduate foreign student increases notwithstanding) the proportionate decrease in undergraduate foreign enrollment over the past 10 years is almost negligible. Furthermore, the distribution of foreign undergraduates by geographic area remains nearly constant, with the exception of Canada (the North America classification of IIE includes only Canada and a sprinkling of Bermudians), which indicates a 6 percent decrease in proportion to the total over the past decade.

*Table 1. Undergraduate Breakdown by Geographic Area*

| | 1962 | | 1972 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Area* | *Total* | *Percent of total* | *Total* | *Percent of total* |
| Far East | 8,896 | 26.8 | 20,993 | 28.4 |
| Europe | 3,591 | 10.8 | 6,689 | 9.0 |
| Latin America | 7,622 | 23.0 | 18,434 | 25.0 |
| Africa | 2,821 | 8.5 | 6,312 | 8.5 |
| Near and Mid-East | 5,324 | 16.0 | 11,635 | 15.7 |
| North America | 4,414 | 13.3 | 5,454 | 7.4 |
| Oceania | 469 | 1.4 | 1,180 | 1.6 |
| Stateless | 66 | .2 | 122 | .2 |
| Country unknown | | | 3,149 | 4.2 |

### *My Survey*

Accepting no significant change in the graduate–undergraduate ratio nor in the areas of origin, we can proceed to the responses of institutions and their policies and practices regarding the foreign undergraduate. With no pretense at academic research reliability or comprehensive data gathering, I chose to conduct an informal questioning of what I felt to be somewhat representative institutions around the country. To 68 inquiries I received 56 responses, broken down as follows: 21 from large, publicly supported institutions (enrollment over 15,000); 10 from smaller publicly supported institutions (enrollment under 15,000); 9 from large private institutions (enrollment over 10,000); 8 from smaller private institutions (enrollment under 10,000); and 8 from two-year institutions, all public (listed at the end of this paper). Questions dealt with policies on the recruitment and admission of foreign undergraduates, goals in admitting them, utilization of these students on the campus or in the community, and other thoughts relating to current conditions of general enrollment trends and financial problems of higher education. Although only 56 institutions are represented, their foreign undergraduate enrollment, from the numbers they themselves submitted, totals 21,070, a significant proportion of the nationwide presence.

### *The Student Marketplace*

Before examining the responses, let's back up for a look at the general climate of undergraduate enrollment around the country and its fiscal implications. The following statements are extracted from recent newspaper and journal articles.

"American colleges, faced with financial pressures they have not known since Depression days, are resorting more and more to the hard sell in search of students.

"The competition for enrollment and the money it produces is generally polite, but fierce. The stakes are millions of dollars nationally and, for some schools, survival. Some will not make it. . . .

"And it has led to recruiting and promotional techniques that the schools never thought of, or rejected out of hand, a few short years ago—direct-mail barrages, radio spot commercials, scholarships to

lure students who do not need the financial help, and occasionally tuition rebates for students who recruit others. . . .

"[It is] estimated that only 10 percent of the nation's colleges and universities had more applications for admissions this year than last, despite greatly increased spending for recruiting.

"Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, where plunging enrollment has helped force the dismissal of 104 faculty members, opened a recruiting office in Chicago last year, to the annoyance of others in the state system. Colorado School of Mines, under a state mandate to increase enrollment, has just hired a Denver consulting firm to help it find a bigger market for its world-renowned mineral engineering program.

"Some of the recruiting aids the colleges are using are obvious enough. New York University, for instance, has only recently begun to include a return envelope when it responds to a prospective student's request for an application form."[5]

"Now there suddenly is a new kind of trauma—the colleges' increasingly desperate fear that there will not be enough students to fill the available freshman places. Last September there were over one-half million vacancies, each of them representing a small puddle of red ink in the ledgers. . . .

"The simple fact is that many colleges which only a few years ago had been sand-bagging their admissions offices against an unmanageable flood are now drumming up trade. . . .

"What has caused the sudden change that is transforming the students' position from one of eager supplication to sought-after patronization? The most important factor is overexpansion."[6]

" 'In our profession, the new catchword is marketing; everyone is running around bowing to this new deity,' said Chapman College admissions director, Mike Fox. . . .

". . . the recruiter for one liberal arts college . . . admitted, as did Fox at Chapman College, that the very survival of the independent school

5. Evan Jenkins, "Colleges Shift to Hard Sell in Recruiting of Students," *The New York Times*, March 31, 1974.

6. Fred M. Hechinger, "Colleges in Search of Freshmen," *Saturday Review/World*, April 6, 1974.

s at stake in the fierce competition for student enrollment."[7]

"High-prestige schools such as Johns Hopkins, Stanford, and Harvard still are picking and choosing from long lists of applicants.

"On the other hand, many well-regarded institutions—including popular state colleges and universities as well as some private colleges that are "small but good"—may have openings for next autumn after normal spring deadlines for applications are past."[8]

"State colleges, for example, will reach a dreaded watershed in September as fewer freshmen show up than last fall, for the first overall decline in first-year students in peacetime memory. . . .

"Many middle-class parents, apparently convinced that only the children of the poor can qualify for scholarships, are giving up on private colleges for their sons and daughters even though, according to some financial aid officers, they might be eligible for student aid too.

"Requests for financial aid have been declining at many prestigious private colleges, and some, like Columbia, are embarrassed by hundreds and thousands of dollars in freshman scholarship funds still unspent because too few qualified students asked for it. . . .

"Although the number of persons reaching the college age of 18 will not begin to taper off until the end of the decade, the proportion of high school graduates who finally choose college has declined steadily in past years, from more than 60 percent in the late 1960s to less than 58 percent this year.

"The highly publicized unemployment rates for teachers and others with general liberal arts backgrounds is being blamed for this apparent drop in interest. A growing number of young people and their parents appear to be deciding that a delay of four years before entering the job market, plus the thousands of dollars in expenses and deferred wages college entails, has made the bachelor's degree less enticing.

"Instead, available figures suggest young people are enrolling in short-term courses aimed at providing specific skills—often in private, profit-making institutions—or enrolling in two-year colleges, or going

7. Scott Moore, "Stakes Are High as Colleges Attempt To Recruit Students," *The Los Angeles Times*, March 10, 1974.

8. *U.S. News & World Report*, April 15, 1974.

straight into the labor market."[9]

"The Census Bureau reports that the number of college students studying engineering and the physical sciences in the fall of 1972 was down 33 percent from the enrollment five years earlier."[10]

Such statements do not necessarily imply that institutions suffering from declining numbers of undergraduate applicants are launching campaigns to recruit from overseas, but they do present a situation that should be borne in mind as we prepare our blueprint at this colloquium.

### *Admissions Posture*

Table 2 summarizes the replies to some of the questions received from the 56 institutions I surveyed. These institutions were asked to characterize their current policies toward admission of foreign undergraduates on the basis of the following three choices:

I. Because of decreasing enrollment, we are actively recruiting undergraduates, including foreign candidates.

II. We make no special efforts to recruit foreign undergraduates, but we encourage their applications when they contact us.

III. We make no special efforts to recruit foreign undergraduates and provide information that indicates that they are in strong competition with American students, which may be interpreted as discouraging in tone.

Those 11 institutions that chose I. indicated the following means of foreign student recruitment: letters to Hong Kong schools in an effort to recruit students; alumni letters asking for personal recommendations of prospective students; promotional letters sent to principals telling them of admission of their students and requesting that information be passed on to other interested students; use of overseas contacts (American Friends of the Middle East, American Korean Foundation, Institute of International Education, American Scandinavian Foundation, cultural attaches, secondary schools) for referrals and

9. Iver Peterson, "The Next Freshman Class: Shifting Pattern," *The New York Times*, May 5, 1974.

10. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 1, 1974.

## *Table 2. Survey of Institutional Policies and Practices regarding Foreign Undergraduate Students*

| | | *Large, state-supported institutions: 21 (over 15,000)* | *Smaller, state-supported institutions: 10 (less than 15,000)* | *large, private institutions: 9 (more than 10,000)* | *Smaller, private institutions: 8 (less than 10,000)* | *Two-year institutions: 8 (all public)* | *Totals* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Policies* | Because of decreasing enrollment, we are actively recruiting. | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3* | 0 | 11 |
| | No special efforts to recruit foreign undergraduates, but encourage application when they contact us | 16 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 37 |
| | Information provided may discourage application from foreign undergraduates | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| | Use agencies or services overseas to promote recruitment | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
| | Have a quota for the admission of foreign undergraduates. | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 |
| | Have stated goals in admitting foreign undergraduates. | 6 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 18 |
| | Utilization of foreign undergraduates ("yes" responses) | 17 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 37 |

* One other institution had limited recruiting.

dissemination of promotional materials; brochures to international organizations, United Nations delegations, and foreign embassies; recruitment through Rotary International; a foreign alumni newsletter; recruitment at local two-year colleges; and, in the case of one institution, an annual recruiting trip to Asia.

The majority of institutions, it may be noted, do not carry on active solicitation of applicants, but are encouraging to those who initiate contact. Only 7 of the 56 institutions felt that their foreign applicants will face tough competition with American applicants and therefore must be answered in a tone that may be interpreted as discouraging.

It is to be noted that 6 of the 13 institutions indicating that they maintained foreign admission quotas were public community colleges. Because of the increased popularity of these institutions, their generally open-enrollment practices for residents, and their base of district and state fiscal support, most have found it necessary to restrict the numbers of foreign students admitted.

### *Goals*

Only 18 of the 56 institutions had any known, explicit goals in admitting foreign undergraduates. Their statements of purpose are briefly extracted as follows (listed in no particular order):

*Large public institutions.* Value of cultural exchange, belief in the "international campus," importance of international dimension/cross-cultural contacts, international contacts with various countries, contribution to academic climate and cosmopolitan atmosphere.

*Smaller public institutions.* Maintaining diversified campus community, avoid parochialism, provide education not available in home country, expand horizons of American students, build more cosmopolitan campus.

*Large private institutions.* Preference given to those who will use education to benefit homeland.

*Smaller private institutions.* Cultural diversity, enrichment, cultural balance, an inter-American experience.

*Two-year institutions.* Cross-cultural interaction, two-year technical/terminal programs, contribution to education of students at the college and promotion of international understanding in community and throughout the world, bring lower socioeconomic-level students from

developing countries, development of human resources of student's country.

### *Utilization*

Another question posed was, "Are foreign undergrads utilized in any particular ways on your campus or in your community?" Thirty-seven affirmative responses indicated the following kinds of student involvement, in order of frequency: speaking engagements in general, resource persons in primary and secondary schools, campus resources in the classroom, orientation leaders, language bank and translation services, language instruction programs, community projects, student government, written articles, international dinners, cultural exchange programs, recruitment for admissions, student advising, religious presentations, and model U.N. programs.

The nature of student utilization did not seem to relate to the nature or size of the institution in any particular pattern. A few respondents reacted negatively to the term "utilization," inferring exploitation.

### *English*

Institutions were requested to state their English-language requirements for foreign undergraduate admission and indicate whether they offered special courses in English for Foreign Students or referred them to other facilities. All but a few indicated that the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) was either required or recommended, and minimum scores ranged from 450 to 550, with most at 500. Interestingly, the test requirement bore no apparent correlation to whether an institution offered intensive, minimum remedial, or no English for foreign students. Of the 56 institutions polled, 34 offered some special courses in English for Foreign Students, but these offerings were spread throughout the institutions surveyed, and the offerings did not correlate with the size or nature of the institution. Some of the most "prestigious" institutions, including those most sophisticated in foreign student admissions procedures, were the most flexible in their TOEFL position (that is, they did not require TOEFL or had sliding minimum scores, with admission dependent on other factors). Few of the institutions polled indicated any interest in breakdown scores of the component parts of the examination. Several were willing to ac-

cept scores on the American Language Institute Georgetown University (ALIGU) or Michigan tests in lieu of TOEFL.

In summary, the English-language requirements, use of specific tests, and availability of special English programs versus referral elsewhere were variable and showed no particular patterns, beyond the preponderance of some TOEFL usage in which the average minimum acceptable score was 500.

*Changes*

Finally, the surveyed institutions were asked to share any thoughts regarding the ways in which foreign undergraduate admissions practices may be changing because of current conditions. Nearly all these comments related to rising costs of education and student subsistence, reduced financial aid, and greater restrictions on the movement of foreign students as imposed by visa and employment regulations. Most institutions anticipate decreased numbers of foreign applicants even though some are not yet experiencing this trend. A shift toward candidates of the economic elite and a realization that fewer of the students who are accepted may be able to enroll because of financial limitations were generally acknowledged. On the other hand, one private institution expressed satisfaction at now being able to compete in tuition cost with its state-supported rival, because of increased nonresident fees being imposed by the latter. Another expressed position favored shorter, one-to-two-year technical programs over those that lead students into long-term academic pursuits.

In summary, thoughts regarding the current foreign undergraduate situation as influenced by current conditions were overwhelmingly reactionary to those conditions, reflecting a somewhat passive acceptance of a variety of negative influences on a once brighter scene.

In refreshing contrast, the respondent of one private institution replied as follows: "It's my personal opinion that the character of undergrad life now does not encourage happy assimilation of the new undergrad into campus life. Students are generally, at least at [my campus] and probably elsewhere, unimaginative, 1950-ish, grade-hungry, introspective, self-centered – indeed a bit dull after the exciting environment of the late 60s. Foreign undergraduates could have a good effect on that, if properly programmed."

One topic, of obsessive prominence during the last decade, was with rare exception absent from the comments. It suggests a title for my next colloquium paper: "What Ever Happened to Brainy Drain?"

## *Exceptions*

Though one may deduce that the vast majority of foreign undergraduates are in the United States through their individual initiative in gaining admission to an institution without clearly formulated policies, quotas, or aggressive recruitment of any particular category of student to participate in any specific educational program, there are notable exceptions.

1. For fall 1973 the Institute of International Education placed in American institutions 153 undergraduates from 24 countries or territories by means of a variety of tuition, maintenance, and travel awards, many of which included commitments to the institution or sponsoring agency for personal contributions such as language drill instruction, active involvement in residence programs, and speaking engagements to civic groups. This undergraduate placement represents an increase over the previous year's total of 127 undergraduates and does not include placements made by III-Atlanta in the PETECA program described below. Historically, III has been engaged in locating undergraduates for the one-year, nondegree cultural exchange, a concept which, according to III, receives decreasing financial support. Typically, 2 out of 3 Europeans placed will be content with the one-year, nondegree experience, since in Europe the American bachelor's degree is of less significance at home than the university degree from one's own country. On the other hand, 9 out of 10 Latin American undergraduates placed by III are degree oriented, and as such are more difficult to place. III also indicated that grants with built-in work commitments have also increased in proportion to straight scholarships.

2. PETECA (Program of Educational and Technical Exchange with Central America and the Caribbean), a project of the Southeast Regional Office of III in Atlanta has brought students from Central American and Caribbean countries (plus Peru) to colleges, universities, and technical institutes of the Southeastern United States for technical/terminal programs that reflect priority manpower needs of

the countries represented. Fifty-nine students were placed in 1972 and another 42 in 1973 through a combination of financial resources including tuition waivers, loans, and part-time employment. Through extensive cooperation of institutions, their communities, and the home countries a viable model of much-needed technical training is developing.

3. The City College of San Francisco restricts its admission of foreign nonimmigrant students to those who enroll for technical/terminal programs, and has found that its capacity to absorb qualified candidates is far below the number who wish to matriculate. Joseph Jacobsen has already submitted a statement on this policy[11] and is here to discuss it further, so I'll not elaborate.

4. Elbert Covell College, the Spanish-language member of the University of the Pacific complex, brings Latin American students specifically to provide the inter-American experience to all students enrolled in the College, and tries to insure return of the Latin American students to their home countries on completion of studies. Alistair McCrone has already described this unique example of bringing undergraduates from other countries into a pan-national setting, where no one is a foreign student.

5. The Hong Kong and German situations, while not analogous, provide circumstances for special enrollments of undergraduates from specific countries. In the case of Hong Kong, we have long been at the receiving end of overtures from a territory where masses of well-qualified secondary school leavers cannot possibly be accommodated in the few postsecondary institutions in existence within its boundaries. When you add to that situation the Chinese tradition of priority for the highest level of formal education attainable, and a lack of ability to absorb trained professionals into the Colony (not to mention the increasing affluence of many Hong Kong parents), the pressures to admit Hong Kong undergraduates into our institutions become irresistible. Many undergraduate institutions, particularly those with decreasing enrollments that depend on tuition revenue for survival, are intensifying their recruitment efforts in Hong Kong and some other selected Asian areas. Phil Byers, director of the III Mid-

11. See note on page 41.

west Office, is developing an East Asian recruitment tour to East and Southeast Asia for a selected group of admissions officers on the theory that a well-planned collective effort could provide maximum service for those interested institutions with relatively little recruitment experience in that part of the world.

The efforts of the Federal Republic of Germany to place some 500 freshmen in institutions in the United States stems from the lack of places at home and the belief that it would be less costly to subsidize these students in vacant slots on this side of the Atlantic than to expand institutional facilities at home. The program, coordinated through Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., is still too young to be examined in detail, but may point the way to further such supply-and-demand contracts between America and other countries.[12]

There are certainly other instances of well-developed academic programs at the undergraduate level (some in the Jenkins paper), but the overwhelming majority of foreign students at that level in the United States are institutionally located and accommodated because of happenstance. Those administrators responsible for the admission and programming of students from other countries are generally uncertain about what lies ahead and are troubled by the constraints of regulatory actions and reduced funding. The foreign undergraduate applicant may be encouraged, but what nature and degree of institutional self-interest lies behind such encouragement?

12. See an account of the program's status as of June 1974 on pages 76-77.

## *Institutions Surveyed*

*Large, state-supported institutions:*
Colorado State University
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
Georgia State University
Iowa State University
University of New Mexico
Western Michigan University
University of Utah
University of Colorado
University of Iowa
California State University, Northridge
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee
University of Florida
University of Tennessee–Knoxville
University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Maryland–College Park
University of Massachusetts–Amherst
University of Wisconsin–Madison
University of Houston
Indiana University

*Smaller, state-supported institutions:*
University of Wyoming
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Montana
University of Rhode Island
University of Missouri–Kansas City
University of Alabama
Portland State University
Washington State University
Oregon State University
Morgan State College

*Large, private institutions:*
Howard University
Stanford University
Columbia University
Harvard College
George Washington University
American University
Cornell University*
University of Southern California
University of San Francisco

*Smaller, private institutions:*
Seattle Pacific College
University of the Pacific
Golden Gate University
Washington University
University of Notre Dame
University of Denver
Vanderbilt University
Roosevelt University

*Two-year colleges:*
Northwestern Michigan College
Lane Community College
Merritt College
City College of San Francisco
Pasadena City College
Miami-Dade Community College
Monterey Peninsula College
College of San Mateo

* Partially state supported.

## Responses to the Paper

Joel Slocum, chairman of the discussion, called for reports from the four groups.

### *Reports from the Discussion Groups*

*Group I.* Lornie Kerr reported that a major concern of Group I was for methods of recruiting. The general reaction from the group was that there is more headhunting going on than we want to admit, despite the response to Zeigler's survey. It was suspected that many institutions try to cover up or rationalize their use of this sort of recruitment.

Different members of the group reacted variously to the policy of recruiting foreign students as athletes. Probably if such recruitment suits the individual institution's interests it will adopt that policy. And probably if this method helps a foreign student obtain his education, it may not always be inappropriate.

The group generally supported the happenstance idea of how foreign students arrive in the United States—there isn't any particular pattern and we don't really know how and why who goes where.

From the viewpoint of state-supported institutions and community colleges, concern was expressed that eventually taxpayers and legislators may question the idea of wholesale recruitment of foreign students—or of students in general. And the question was raised whether the wholesale recruitment (or, open enrollment) concept does affect the quality of undergraduate education today. Are we helping or damaging ourselves when we expand the vistas of recruitment in that particular sense?

The question was raised about the possibility of limiting foreign student enrollment to graduate programs. Some institutions are moving in that direction through various strictures on undergraduate foreign student admissions, such as establishing geographical quotas. Also relevant is the changing picture abroad. In several emerging African nations, for example, higher education opportunities for students are now available at home. The point was made in this connection that United States government-sponsored foreign student education has been available primarily to graduates. Should we now

place some emphasis on providing financial assistance at the undergraduate level?

In relation to recent discussions among admissions directors of the necessity for ethical standards and practices in admitting students, the group felt that we must be certain not to make exceptions in the case of foreign students. We should take care that differences in programs at different colleges are spelled out clearly by the institution and by overseas information agencies before the student is enrolled.

It was noted that we need to develop curriculums that are directly relevant to the foreign student and that foreign students help to set up. Probably all of us here need to look at the total complex processes that we are involved in when dealing with foreign students. If we expect people overseas—potential foreign students, foreign governments, even our own people abroad—to understand fully the various options open to students when they arrive in this country, then we need to improve our own understanding of the broader aspect of postsecondary education. What is needed, perhaps, is a worldwide understanding of the meaning of curriculums, programs, degrees, institutions—both traditional and the innovative, but especially those programs and institutions that are different from those leading to the traditional bachelor's degree. For example, some educators seem not to understand that a community college has something more to offer than "career education" or vocational-technical terminal programs.

One member suggested that once the foreign undergraduate students are here we may be too casual about them. This speaker made the point that if suddenly all the foreign students in the United States were to go en masse to the Soviet Union, our government would be deeply and immediately concerned about getting them back in the United States.

The group agreed that more follow-up procedures are needed with foreign students to help us determine how well we are meeting their needs.

* * *

*Group II.* Ross Alm reported that Group II, instead of reacting to the facts presented in Ziegler's paper, concentrated on expanding and going beyond those facts. A major topic of discussion was the strained financial situation of many colleges today. This reality often prevents

any expansion into new programs. Colleges are faced with budget cuts and a decrease in the numbers of students. Funding for international education departments, which generally is based on the number of students served, is very likely going to continue to decrease for the foreseeable future. And as for implementing new programs, which costs money, it is easy to say, "Do something and don't worry about the money," but difficult to accomplish.

Institutions and state governments are apt to hold opposing views on institutional growth, and these views are relevant to foreign students who are not sponsored financially by their native countries. The question of growth—of actively recruiting students, not only foreign students but all students in the area—seems to be more justified from the institutional point of view than the state legislature's. Of course, when recruiting is done simply to get more money from the state because that's how the institutions are funded, the institution is on very shaky ground. However, each successive legislature feels increased pressure for lower taxes, and institutional support and expansion are only part of the state's concern. It seemed obvious to the group that only governmental self-interest and not any broadly altruistic attitude will lead to adequate funding of international education programs. When we seek any kind of active federal support for undergraduate foreign students we are going to have to stress to the government how these programs serve the self-interest of the United States.

The group was unanimous in agreeing that the important question to be addressed is: How can we serve the foreign students after they are here? We permit them to come, we even encourage them to come, we have education that they want and that they can't get in their own countries. But, knowing that they are coming, and coming under these kinds of circumstances, what can we do for them once they are here?

The group discussed at some length the need for an institutional exercise in self-examination, and one member suggested the possibility of developing a checklist to facilitate self-examination.

* * *

*Group III.* Rose Hayden reported the group's general agreement on the goals in Ziegler's paper and appreciation of the facts it presented.

The group discussion, however, turned from the paper to several problems of particular programs.

First, there was an informational discussion of the Georgetown University plan[1] to admit substantial numbers of West German students and its inherent problems: equivalency of degrees, political considerations, disparity between the curriculums that the Germans want to study and those that are available to them here, and so forth.

Of major concern to the group was the recent retrenchment in the office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS)—that is, the more stringent regulations on summer jobs and part-time jobs here for foreign students—and the consequent probability of a reduction in the number of students. It is hoped that the new regulations on foreign student employment will not damage our institutions' relations with countries that customarily send students here and that are concerned with equity in student exchanges, parity in numbers, and tuition differentials. Any sort of reprisal from those countries would be detrimental to our students studying abroad. Of course, it was pointed out, many of the national laws affecting American students working overseas are equally strict. There was discussion of a proposed bill in the House of Representatives, which would return to the institutions the control of foreign students' right to a job, and more discussion of the difficulty of applying the INS rules uniformly.

In relation to institutional priorities, the group discussed various aspects of how to ascertain what constitutes support of foreign students. What does it cost students to study in this country? What are the financial aspects for the institution? What guidelines can an institution present to a consular officer?

It was felt that we should be able to monitor (institutionally or in ways that we can communicate to institutions and to each other) the effects of the new interpretations of regulations on jobs for foreign students, as well as on the admission of foreign students based on their ability to show financial support before they get here. Although none of us could foresee the effects, it was felt that we should attempt to monitor them.

Group III gave a high priority to the concept of "putting our own

1. See Father Ryan's explanation of the plan, on pages 76-77.

house in order." There was candid discussion of several cases in which less than ethical behavior caused problems among faculty members at institutions, or with foundations that sponsor students and expect them to return to their home countries. In order to make a more effective case for foreign student programs, we professionals must face the question of whether we sometimes condone abuses within our system in the name of undergirding an ideal or by being somewhat absolutist in our interpretations.

The question of how to develop guidelines was discussed—not just institutional guidelines to ensure the financial support of students but also guidelines that will give consular officials and others an appreciation of what an institution is like and of what foreign students can expect to encounter.

The group urged consideration of community colleges as a rich resource that perhaps is not being properly or adequately utilized. They have a particular relevance to the third world and they're flexible. Studies have indicated a higher degree of compatibility between the community colleges and some foreign students' perceptions of their educational experiences. Creative institutional responses to students' needs should include a wider range of educational alternatives and modes of instruction and experiences.

Despite its emphasis on the reality of several problems we face, the group ended on a fairly positive note. All of us represent agencies and institutions that have vigorous programs, and we're not in deep trouble. We do need creative institutional responses to find our way around some points of blockage that tend to inhibit continued expansion of our programs for foreign students. And we need to support the people who deal with legislators and policy makers.

* * *

*Group IV.* Stephen Palmer reported on the group's concern that Ziegler's paper, while very useful and informative, had concentrated almost entirely on the four-year, degree programs. What is meant by "undergraduate education in the United States"? There is a multiplicity of programs, certainly, but what do foreign students expect to get out of them? It was noted by one expert on Nigeria that it matters very little to a bright village boy whether he goes to a fender-bender school or a degree-granting institution; he's going to America

for his education. So the group turned to a discussion of one of the realities in education today, a dimension beyond the community colleges—that is, the proprietary schools. Most of these are grouped in four national associations, and the group felt that there should be a reaching out to these proprietary school associations. They have approached NAFSA with a suggestion to work together on accreditation (their accreditation reform) and training (our experiences in English-language teaching) and so forth. There was some doubt about the compatibility of the aims of the traditional four-year colleges and those of what was termed the "proprietary-vocational school lobby." And one of the members wondered if this reaching out would find a useful operational responsiveness. But the group unanimously urged that at least the effort should be made and that it could be productive. It was noted that this colloquium cannot hear the viewpoint of the proprietary schools, as they have no representatives here.

Group IV discussed the dangers of lowering the admissions standards for foreign students. Many good institutions have already relaxed the admissions screening process. The consensus was that it's quite all right to take in some high-risk foreign students, along with high-risk American students, provided adequate remedial tutorial services are available.

In a number of contexts there was raised the whole question of English-language competence and training. Group IV urged very strongly that the general colloquium discussion should deal with the topic.

Concern was expressed at the lack of data about foreign students: What happens to the foreign students when they leave the institution? How do they use their education when it's completed? How many come to community colleges from proprietary schools, and from two-year to four-year colleges? But, while urging more data collection and analysis, the group cautioned that the data search should not be an excuse for inaction.

Another participant pointed out that the particular data we use are in themselves image making. For example, we speak of 150,000 foreign students in the United States, including graduate students. (After subtracting immigrant foreign students, the number is about 123,000.) But a very different picture is seen if the data are coming

from the INS, the regulatory agency primarily concerned. In its view there are 300,000 foreign students—that is, F and J visa holders.

It was suggested that since 65 percent of the foreign undergraduates come from 18 countries, it might be best to concentrate just on those 18 in cross-acculturating activities, and let students from other countries fend for themselves, rather than try to serve everyone's needs.

The consensus in Group IV was that, as the students continue to come to our educational bazaar in a rather haphazard way, we should concentrate not on the rhetoric but on the best service for the students, however they get here.

### *Remarks from the Chairman*

Before calling for discussion of the group reports, Joel Slocum, chairman of the session, spoke about the direction of the colloquium. The term "undergraduate education" includes a great variety of programs: postsecondary proprietary; junior college and community college technical-vocational, terminal; junior college and community college two-year, transfer, liberal arts, technical-professional; four-year, liberal arts, technical-professional. There is further diversity within programs, especially at the bachelor's level. Some liberal arts programs are traditional in structure; others have no requirements at all. So it's very difficult to find a conceptual framework for this colloquium.

Perhaps it's best to go back to two things Ziegler mentioned. He posed a question about the amount of self-interest that underlies the encouragement given by institutions to foreign undergraduate students to study in the United States. He also said that the majority of undergraduate foreign students in the United States are where they are and are accommodated where they are largely by happenstance. These notions of self-interest and happenstance, Slocum said, are readily understandable. The self-interest of institutions as they encourage foreign students is disturbing to contemplate, and could, if unchecked, in the face of increasing pressures to maintain enrollments, seriously undermine much of what we have achieved in working with foreign students during the last 25 years. And happenstance is an apt word for what has been called a marketplace or a bazaar—that is, a

very complicated flow of students to, in, from, and among institutions, as they give expression by their choice of institutions to a varied assortment of plans, motivations, desires, purposes, and goals.

These notions of happenstance and self-interest are also more concrete than "international education" and "institutional priorities." International education is basically the *interaction* of students from different cultures as each goes about acquiring an education; and the *results* of that interaction, which we hope will be a broadening of outlook and a transcendence of congenital ethnocentrism. Perhaps we should talk less about these big notions, which are pretty abstract, and more about foreign students.

Our business is essentially doing our best to see to it that foreign students have the best possible experience in this country: academically, culturally, socially. We have mentioned at this conference some concrete ways in which we can improve on our performance of this job:

- Working for the inclusion of assessment of foreign student programs in accreditation, so as to improve both counseling and selection.
- Reaching out to proprietary schools to help them upgrade their services to foreign students.
- Continuing and intensifying the existing efforts of the NAFSA Field Service Program to educate institutions to their manifold responsibilities.
- Lobbying intensively for more lenient government regulations regarding foreign student employment.

We're not bringing the majority of undergraduate foreign students here, they're just coming with our sufferance. In this context, "international education" means trying to help foreigners reach their educational goals and in the process to become citizens of the world; and "institutional priorities" means, for the most part, seeing to it that staff and budget are allocated in just proportion to the size of the foreign student body, or to admitting no more foreign students than staff and budget permit.

### *General Colloquium Discussion*

After expressing enthusiastic agreement with Slocum's remarks, colloquium participants focused the discussion on the question of pro-

prietary schools. Aside from their standing relative to the more traditional higher education institutions in America, they are of particular concern to us because of the large numbers of foreign students that they enroll. One concern is that we don't know how many foreign students are in proprietary schools and how they are being dealt with in regard to programs, services, and job placement. Mistreatment of foreign students affects international education adversely, so it's in our self-interest to approach proprietary schools—for example, to invite them to NAFSA regional meetings. It was noted that the United States Office of Education has published a manual listing most proprietary institutions—about 8,000 or 9,000—and their national associations. One member mentioned that the trend of NAFSA in recent years has been to broaden its encouragement of membership and to move out from the earlier concept of professionalism in its narrow sense. NAFSA has been encouraging the whole community of people who are interested in international education, including students and community volunteers, to come in and participate through the open membership policy, in the belief that this can only produce positive results. However, in relation to the Field Service Program, there have been problems in providing field services through NAFSA to institutions that were postsecondary but not in the category of traditional academic institutions. A member stated that the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs had concentrated on higher education institutions with the Field Service Program and doubted that the Bureau's resources would expand much beyond that.

Another colloquium member mentioned, in relation to the possibility of separate foreign student visas to be used at proprietary schools, that the American Council on Education would not wish to be involved in policies that would separate out different types of education and that might by implication classify different institutions as first and second class. The Council has long sought acceptance of the whole notion of postsecondary education as an entity not split into various tracks. Categorizing different types of education and assigning different types of regulations to them would cause concern. That concern, of course, does not mitigate the necessity to reach out to all types of postsecondary institutions, improve communications with them, and come to grips with possible abuses. Although

not many proprietary schools have joined NAFSA and not many attend the major nationwide activities, they are incorporated into local activities in some areas.

There was a marked difference of opinion regarding the advisability of increasing the options in education for foreign students. On the one hand, one member urged that if we have a sincere commitment to trying to meet the needs of foreign students we must consider the option of the black college. Many of the African leaders who received their education in American black colleges continue to send students to these colleges. Discussions in groups such as this one would benefit from some representation from the black institutions, which have a long history of concern for international education and could make meaningful recommendations.

In reference to developing more curriculums, other speakers urged that, instead of setting up special programs for foreign students, efforts should be directed toward integrating them into the mainstream of American education. One member mentioned that often when institutions or states set up special programs for foreign students in addition to or aside from the regular curriculum, they find that these programs have a devastating psychological effect on the students they are meant to serve.

A specific international education plan that received a good deal of attention was the Student Exchange Program (STEP) at Georgetown University, as outlined by the Reverend Edmund Ryan. West German students who are assured of higher education by the German education law receive an annual stipend which may be spent only in certain countries. An amendment has been introduced in the German legislature to include the United States among those countries. Because of overcrowding in the German universities, it is likely that large numbers of students will be interested in studying here: 30,000 students a year had been mentioned, but a more realistic estimate is 500 students in 1975 and a 5,000 student maximum over a 3- or 4-year period. Several problems are involved in the plan. One is the plan's political sponsorship by the Christian Democratic Party and the consequent opposition from the opposition party. There is also a problem in the equivalency of degrees—whether the American M.A. or M.S. degree can take the place of the Staatsexamen for German students. Another

question was whether German students would be admitted at the sophomore or the junior level in American undergraduate institutions. (It has now been agreed that they will come in at the sophomore level, subject to the decision of the admissions officer at the local institution. Probably national norms will be developed among participating institutions.) The STEP program will have a separate incorporation, which will allow people to make tax-exempt donations. It will be directed jointly by Americans and Germans.[2]

Some contradictions became apparent as the discussion progressed. One was that while undergraduate education is very diverse and complex and that this is necessary and a good thing, there was also a feeling among colloquium members that there is a need to adapt the American curriculum to foreign students' needs—and these two ideas conflict. Undergraduate education is so complex, why complicate it further by adapting undergraduate education to the needs of foreign students from a variety of countries? Another contradiction was evident in the emphasis, on one hand, on the fact that undergraduate education is deeply rooted in American culture and society in attitudes, in the way problems are solved, and so on. Yet McCrone's paper emphasized that no Americanization should take place. This leads to the question of whether foreign students come here to get a watered-down version of American education—aren't they actually coming because they want an American education in all senses? This seeming tension between diversity as opposed to adaptation was not recognized by one member, who felt that through incorporating new suggestions and points of view of international students a reform of American undergraduate education could be effected. Also, several participants questioned whether Americanization wasn't desired by some foreign students while others preferred to keep their own culture.

One member raised the question, in terms of looking at the quality and coverage of present foreign undergraduate programs, of identifying inadequacies as one way of evaluating the quality of our programs. There are, for example, many kinds of activities on behalf of the students at the entry level (admissions, pre-enrollment, enrollment) but

2. As of June 1974.

very little is done in the predeparture, re-entry, and follow-up areas. It was suggested that we might have a "departure officer" for foreign students, who would keep records on all students who earn degrees and speak to them personally if they are interested in job placement, as a placement officer often does for American students. At this point, another participant questioned the degree to which we provide special services for foreign students over and above and different from those we provide for American students. Perhaps we should bring foreign students into the mainstream at this point, so that the regular placement officer is responsible for follow-up and job placement rather than the foreign student officer.

The last two specific priorities for action named were: that we must convince our national legislators of the advantages of enrolling foreign students in our institutions, and that institutions should engage in self-study to determine whether they have a commitment to international education.

# 4. A Practical Approach to the Development of Institutional Priorities

*by Hugh M. Jenkins*

### *The Rhetoric*

*National.* Inspired, or, perhaps more appropriately, appalled by the inhumanities of the 1930s and the holocaust of the 40s, the world resounded in the 50s and 60s with statements of commitment to everything that might contribute to international understanding. High on the list of priorities was international education. Here in the United States we had the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 with its forthright preamble: "The purpose of this Act is to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange. . . ." It goes on to say: "and thus assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world."

Tucked away in the deep-freeze, awaiting fulfillment, is the International Education Act of 1966. Its purpose is "that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples and cultures. . . ."

* * *

*Institutional.* This commitment to an international dimension in education is echoed at the institutional level. In a random sampling of statements on institutional goals one finds such quotations as the following.

"One of the foremost needs and challenges facing the University presently and continuing at least through the remaining decades of the Twentieth Century is the development and implementation of [the university's] role in international affairs" (Iowa State University, January 1969).

"[The university] will make available its rich variety of cultural,

educational, technical, and other resources to its area, to the State of Ohio, to the nation, and to the international community" (Kent State University, 1971-72).

"The involvement of this nation in the affairs of the world places new demands upon education. The University of Florida must produce citizens who are equipped with the knowledge and competency to function intelligently in the vital area of diverse cultures" (University of Florida, 1971).

Similar statements can be found in the catalogs and descriptive literature of practically every college and university across the country. All this rhetoric reflects, I believe, a genuine concern that, in the easier decades immediately following World War II, resulted in the massive increase in the foreign student population in the United States. The fact that the current commitment, both nationally and institutionally, is more apparent than real may be attributed, not to hypocrisy or indifference, but rather to the pressure of other responsibilities and a sense of the increasing remoteness of these global goals.

### *The Reality*

Paradoxically, the harsh realities of recent events may now prove that the national rhetoric is not so far-fetched and that the dream has become a demand. Global issues, and the evident weakening of America's domination of the international money market and its lessening control of global resources, have caused an urgent reappraisal of our national needs and international relationships. The impact of these altered circumstances may be seen in the following extracts from the speech made by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger at the Sixth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly: "Whatever our ideological belief or social structure, we are part of a single international economic system on which *all* our national economic objectives depend. No nation or bloc of nations can unilaterally determine the shape of the future." And, speaking of our mutual interdependence: "Thus economics, technology, and the sweep of human values *impose* a recognition of our interdependence and of the necessity of our collaboration." And, further, referring to the need for cooperation: "No human activity is less national in character than the field of science. No development effort offers more hope than *joint*

technical and scientific cooperation" (italics added).

In the context of the Special Session, in which the developing nations were asserting their claims to the essential resources within their territorial domain, these statements are a far cry from the somewhat arrogant imperialism of the great American economy of only a few years ago. The "mutual understanding" sought in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act and the "knowledge pertaining to other countries" of the International Education Act have suddenly acquired a new significance.

At the same time, and at a different level, the international dimension in education has also become peculiarly attractive to institutions of higher education. To some extent it is indeed the "dimension" in its literal interpretation, as colleges and universities are seeking foreign students to offset their declining enrollments. The problem was identified very clearly by the National Center for Educational Statistics, which noted that there were 680,000 college vacancies in the United States for 1973-74. Significantly, this figure was reported in an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (July 16, 1973) about a proposal to fill some of these vacancies by a massive airlift of German students. Subsequently, on May 13, 1974, the *Chronicle* reported that the quest for students was leading many colleges to adopt sales techniques that were once shunned on campus, and one reads in the *College Board Review* (Fall 1973) a thoughtful article on "the marketing of admissions." The imperatives of underenrollment soon had their effects on the international scene, where there is a thriving business in recruitment. Thus there is a new influx of colleges establishing overseas offices (for example, the May 1974 issue of the Canadian Bureau of International Education (CBIE) bulletin *Communications* reports that the Lake Superior Association of Colleges and Universities has just opened an office in Tokyo to recruit Japanese students) and an increase in universities overseas branches (for example, the proposed Hong Kong branch of Pacific Lutheran University was announced in the April issue of the *Asian Student*).

These and other straws in the wind all suggest that this is indeed a timely occasion to review the institutional priorities for action regarding the undergraduate foreign student. On both the national and the institutional levels there is a growing awareness of the subtle differ-

ence between America's assumption of a paternal responsibility for international affairs and America's need for a fraternal responsiveness to international interests. This change in status commands a new acceptance of the national necessity for international sophistication, transnational familiarity, and the ability to communicate across the barriers of language. It demands a new assessment of institutional priorities at all levels of postsecondary education regarding international education in general and foreign student programs in particular. It is in these circumstances and to meet these needs that we must meet the challenge of devising a practical approach to the development of institutional priorities in regard to the foreign undergraduate student.

While this paper concentrates on the foreign student in the United States, it must be recognized that this is only one part of a much larger institutional involvement in international educational interchange. National purposes and institutional goals must of necessity embrace a program in which international education, as described in the rhetoric, is not a supplement to but rather a direction of contemporary education. In such terms the programs provided for American students abroad, the intrainstitutional relationship of the foreign students to these and other programs on campus, and the interinstitutional relationship between colleges and universities in the United States and in foreign countries must be seen as an integral part of the rationale and the practicalities of the foreign student program.

## Responsibilities and Standards

The recent report of the National Commission on the Financing of Post-secondary Education states that "Institutions of post-secondary education must employ procedures that will enable funders to determine whether resources are being used to achieve the outcomes the funders desire."[1] This demands a particularly well-coordinated response from those who are interested in developing programs for

1. *Financing Post-secondary Education in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), page 176.

foreign undergraduate students. There must be a congruence of the interests of all those who are involved. The primary response must satisfy the needs and interests of those who are charged with the funding and the governance of the institution itself, a subject that is dealt with in more detail at a later point. Complementing this major factor are at least two other interests that claim attention. First, there are those of the individual foreign student, who will certainly be making a major investment of some critical years in the prime of life, and in many cases will also be responsible for providing a major share of the cost of his or her education. Then there are those of the home country, which has already invested in the previous education of its foreign students, is continuing to invest through the export of the currency required to support an educational program in the United States, and has a vested interest in the availability of the trained manpower needed for its social and economic development.

In determining the feasibility, suitability, and consequent attraction of its foreign student programs the institution must keep these interests in mind. In this regard the article on "Marketing Admissions" referred to earlier[2] offers an unusual approach which may serve to clarify and qualify the interests of a college or university in developing a program for the foreign undergraduate student. Among the considerations to be borne in mind Wolff suggests the following:

- Make consumer-oriented plans and policies. In the context of this paper, this idea suggests that the institution will consciously determine its own peculiar contribution to the individual needs of the foreign student and the national needs of the home country. Such an awareness will identify new opportunities for service in the field of international education and serve to focus the attention of the institution on those areas of the world where its particular educational offerings will be most useful.
- Define the institution's mission and describe its capabilities. One of the greatest problems facing the foreign student and the foreign sponsor is that of identifying the most appropriate institution for their proposed educational program. Many mismatches may be avoided and many new applicants may be discovered if the foreign student

2. Jack S. Wolff in *College Board Review*, No. 89, Fall 1973.

contemplating study in America can be assured that the curriculum will provide the appropriate level and encompass the specific subject matter to meet precise educational needs.

- A readiness to adjust admissions plans to a changing environment. This suggests that foreign students should be made aware of whatever is new and special in the institution's program and facilities.

These somewhat arbitrary extractions from the article serve only to indicate what must be recognized as a significant omission in the approach of many institutions to their foreign student programs: the lack of any predetermined policy regarding the admission of foreign students. In too many cases the admission of foreign students is simply a reaction to applications from foreign students. In such cases the end result may fail to satisfy the expectations of all those involved and be seen only as a burden to the institution itself. The approach suggested by Wolff needs to be taken *before* the admissions officer examines the three basic questions regarding the suitability of the applicant: academic qualifications, English-language proficiency, and financial sufficiency. It may well be that the institution will determine that it is its own suitability for the education of foreign students that is in question, and that it is not prepared to make the investment required to follow those conditions set forth in "Responsibilities and Standards in Work with Foreign Students," a section of the *Guideline* put out in 1964 by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA).

## Political Support and Centers of Strength

### *The Information Gap*

In his keynote address to the 1973 annual meeting of the American Council on Education (reported in the *Educational Record*, Winter 1974), Stephen Bailey commented: "We work inadequately at explaining ourselves. . . . Our ignorance about ourselves is an abyss. Our data basis is shockingly inadequate. Responses to responsible political questions tend to emerge too late and in too pretentious and inutile a form."

This criticism is particularly pertinent to those who are involved in

foreign student programs. Programs do not support themselves nor do they derive support when their real worth cannot be demonstrated or substantiated. We may have an instinctive belief that international education, or more properly education for international living, is an imperative in the twentieth century. We may be completely persuaded that the interchange of students and scholars is, as Melvin Fox said, "the best way to tie together the entire international educational effort."[3] We may be convinced that there are inherent values in the development at the undergraduate level of an international campus community. We are certainly confounded by the fact that, on a national scale, we have insufficient data to describe our activities, let alone to prove our case. Paradoxically, there have been a large number of individual studies, based on the experience of institutions or of national groups. These are now being brought together in a three-volume bibliography entitled *International Education: The American Experience*.[4] The material is organized under three headings: dissertations and theses (Volume 1), periodical literature (Volume 2) and other printed sources (Volume 3). The first of these volumes is in print, and it is hoped that when all are available it may be possible to coalesce the findings of these separate studies into some kind of valid overall evaluation of the progress and problems to date. At this time, therefore, any practical approach to the establishment of the priorities for the foreign undergraduate student must begin with a clear definition of our purpose, an exploration of available resources, and the discovery of ways in which these resources may be utilized in program development. Only then can we seek to mobilize the necessary political support on campus and in the community.

### *Some General Considerations*

In the broader context of educational exchange there has been in recent years some question as to whether it is necessary, or even appropriate, to admit foreign students at the undergraduate level. Concern is expressed about the fact that a long period of study abroad may alienate the student from the home country, and about the prior need

3. Fox, *Foreign Students in American Colleges* (New York: Ford Foundation, 1962).

4. Compiled by Agnes Tysse (Los Angeles: Scarecrow Press, 1974).

to strengthen institutions of higher education in the developing nations.

In practice we find that many countries still look to the United States as a prime source of education in certain disciplines; and on the international level there is an obvious relationship between global educational resources and national educational needs. Although the recently initiated plan to bring numbers of German students to American colleges and universities is currently in abeyance,[5] the fact that so many institutions in this country expressed such a lively interest in the project suggests that the principle involved was certainly acceptable. A more determined attempt to solve the problems that became apparent may still lead to the fulfillment of this plan or the development of similar projects.

There is, too, some general acceptance of the need for an international dimension in the education offered at the undergraduate level, as the vast majority of students in this country do not continue in graduate studies. These and many other considerations relating to the interests of each institution must be examined and accepted or rejected if the proper priorities are to be established.

### *Purposes, Goals, and Achievements*

In the report *The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals* by Richard E. Peterson[6] there are critical evaluations, comments, and advice that may be related to the process of establishing the institutional priority for foreign undergraduate student programs. The following points are presented in a somewhat free adaptation to the context of this paper.

- The role of foreign student programs must be related to the accepted functions of the college or university as part of the larger social system in which the institution exists (for example, the transmission of cultural heritage, provision of trained manpower, entry into professions, and so on).
- Program objectives must be clearly defined and enable individuals and agencies outside the campus (for example, prospective students,

5. Father Edmund Ryan assured the group that plans were under way to bring 500 German students to Georgetown University in fall 1974.

6. ERIC Report H5, May 1970.

government units and funding agencies, and so on) to understand their raison d'etre.

- They must be examined in the context of institutional planning in so far as it relates to futuristic thinking about national and international systems.
- Decision makers must be provided with relevant and timely data; thus, a process of information gathering must be established that is focused on the extent to which the educational program is achieving predetermined objectives.

While these and many other equally significant ideas in the report will be familiar to the experienced administrator and member of the faculty, they are significantly lacking in many institutions insofar as the foreign undergraduate student program is concerned. Indeed, it may well be that the fact that the expectation of the administrator and faculty member to receive this kind of evaluation is not fulfilled is the reason for the low rating of the foreign student program in institutional priorities. Certainly such evaluations must be provided by those concerned with the foreign undergraduate student programs "to enable funders to determine whether resources are being used to achieve the outcomes funders desire."

### *Costs and Benefits*

Two of the more important factors in the establishment of institutional priorities are the questions of (1) how much it costs to accept foreign students on campus and provide the services necessary to insure that their experience is beneficial both to the students and the institutions, and (2) what benefits accrue, primarily to the institution and the state, and in a broader context to the nation, from the presence of foreign students—the immediate income and long-term assets they represent. Because these are exceedingly difficult to measure there have been very few attempts to present some kind of "balance sheet" for foreign student activities. An examination made in Indiana demonstrated one side of the equation by showing that the state received about $17.6 million per year from having foreign students within its boundaries.[7]

7. "Foreign Students in Indiana: Our Intangible Exports," *Indiana Business Review*, May/June 1971, Vol. XLVI, Indiana University.

New methods of determining the financial implications of foreign student programs may make it both possible and mandatory to make a more precise fiscal assessment of the institution's involvement in foreign student activities. In the meantime it is important to emphasize that from the financial point of view foreign students do represent income as well as expenditure and an investment that can prove in economic terms to be very much in the national interest.

## *Centers of Strength*

If any practical approach to the development of institutional priorities for undergraduate foreign student programs is to be successful it must be validated by those who are in a position to implement recommendations and endorsed by those who are in a position to provide the necessary support. Such validation and endorsement must be sought with equal vigor on campus and in the community.

* * *

*On Campus.* At the institutional level the primary need is to identify and mobilize the interests of those who are most capable of making an informed judgment and whose opinion will carry the necessary weight. That such a group exists on every campus is indicated by the findings of a NAFSA Task Force on the Mission and Activities of the Association, which recently conducted a series of interviews with leaders of government, education, and the private organizations concerned with international education. The result of their efforts was a lengthy list of observed trends in international education, both worldwide and in the United States. In this list we find: "Increasing numbers of students and of faculty and administrators of educational institutions throughout the world are having opportunities for significant experiences abroad."[8]

This is reflected in the fact that in a number of universities there are directories of faculty with international qualifications and experience. In the University of Kansas, for example, there is a listing of over 400 such faculty members. It is perhaps significant that in the introduction to this directory, published in 1972, it is noted that it "represents the first campus-wide attempt to identify members of the University of

8. NAFSA *Newsletter*, Vol. 24, No. 3, December 1972.

Kansas faculty who have special interests, experience and exposure vis-a-vis countries and cultures beyond the borders of the United States." From these and similar groups at every college and university can be recruited, at the highest level, the members of committees, task forces, or commissions on the international role of the institution who can establish the appropriate priorities for this area of activity. The notable examples of the existence and influence of such institutional units suggest that this should be a feature of every campus. Parenthetically it may be noted that an opinion poll conducted at the University of Minnesota in the fall of 1973 indicated that a majority of the students questioned felt that "foreign students made a valuable contribution to the overall educational experience of the United States students."[9] The support of the student body has not yet been fully explored or mobilized on many campuses. The advocacy of such a group might well be a very positive influence in assessing the priority of and potential support for foreign student programs.

* * *

*Off Campus.* There is some evidence that, once institutional priorities are established, support for foreign student programs may be generated from groups in the local, state, and national community. Current records at the NAFSA central office indicate that there are 477 members of the association who have indicated that they have an interest in the work of the Community Section. These would include, in addition to the representatives of community organizations engaged in foreign student programs and services, the foreign student advisers at many colleges and universities who have continuing contact with civic and church groups offering some kind of service to their foreign students. There is also a supplementary file of over 300 individuals and groups, not members of NAFSA, who are known to be involved in community services to foreign students. Across the country this represents a sizable potential for the development of public support for such foreign student activities as are considered priority items for institutional concern. There is very little evidence of deliberate or intensive efforts to organize these groups into an effective "lobby" for

9. University Opinion Poll 8B, Office of Student Affairs Research Bulletin, Vol. 14, No. 5.

international educational interchange.

At the state level the results of an active campaign to secure legislative support for foreign student programs may be seen in the bill passed by the state of Minnesota Senate and House of Representatives on March 26, 1974. Within certain specified limits this bill grants tuition waivers and also establishes a scholarship fund for the foreign students enrolled at the state institutions. Legislation favorable to foreign students has also been enacted recently in the state of Oregon. The reactions of the various state legislatures is by no means uniform, and in some the trend has been toward a lessening rather than an increase in the support given for foreign student programs or even for the acceptance of foreign students at the state institutions. It does appear, however, that centers of strength can be established within the legislature and, once established, can influence the attitude toward foreign student activities.

At the federal level there is continuing support from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State. Within the Bureau, an Office of Private Cooperation has been established to "promote, facilitate, and broker the actual tapping of private sector resources" on behalf of new and existing programs related to the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act. The degree to which the services of this office may be of indirect support for foreign student programs has yet to be determined but it should certainly be explored.

Within Congress the recent action by the Immigration and Naturalization Service designed to limit summer employment for foreign students has elicited statements of what may be described as "supportive concern" from some members of the House and Senate. Although there may be no immediate action (owing to other matters of more pressing national concern) it is permissible to assume that there will be support for NAFSA's position that there should be a change in regulations governing the admittance and the educational experience of foreign students in American colleges and universities and that such regulations should be recast in the context of promoting educational interchange rather than that of controlling aliens. It may even be that there will be someone who will want to assume the mantle of Senator J. William Fulbright as the champion of international educa-

tional interchange.

Finally, within the private sector of business enterprise there are a number of multinational corporations that have a direct interest in the end product of foreign student undergraduate education in the United States. Procter and Gamble, for example, conducts an energetic campaign to recruit foreign students upon graduation for service in its international subsidiaries. Representatives of this company and of the General Electric Company have taken an active role in NAFSA's efforts to develop a program for identifying home-country employment opportunities for foreign students. In this work they have reported an interest from a number of their colleagues in the business world.

In summary, if a corollary to the establishment of institutional priorities for foreign undergraduate student programs is generating the necessary support for these programs, it follows that this must be sought within the political structure on campus, in the community that is served by the college or university, in the state and federal governments, and among the business community. In each of these areas attempts have been made to secure such support with varying degrees of success, sufficient to justify a more intensive effort at every level.

## *Practicalities*

In order to be practical, foreign students on campus and/or foreign student programs at the undergraduate level must be recognized as part of the institution's resources and a link in the institution's relationships. Over the years, especially at the undergraduate level, there has too often been a disregard for the transnational and intercultural characteristics that may distinguish, or by default, noticeably not distinguish the institution that has foreign students on its campus. Those institutions which have consciously recognized the role that foreign students may play on campus, and exploited the inherent international interinstitutional outreach of foreign student programs have derived significant benefit from their involvement in foreign student activities. Those which have ignored this potential resource often regard the foreign student as a burden to be discarded in times of financial stress. Obviously, therefore, the practical approach to the

development of institutional priorities for foreign undergraduate students must be based on the intent to extract the maximum advantage from their presence.

The following is only a sampling of ways in which foreign students have been or might be used as resources, of resources that may be made available to foreign students, and of programs that have been devised or suggested, some to achieve a permanent status, others to be deferred because of the apparent difficulties involved. The catalog is presented solely for demonstration purposes and in the hope that it may lead to other ideas for the practical use of international educational interchange.

1. Ethnic Heritage Studies Program (Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965—Title IX). This program, which was funded in fiscal year 1974 by an appropriation of $2,375,000, is designed to enable United States students to learn more about the nature of their own heritage and to study the contributions of the cultural heritage of other ethnic groups of the nation. In the guidelines for application for funds, specific reference is made to the assistance that may be obtained "from foreign students pursuing their education in this country."

2. Self-Instructional Language Programs, State University of New York. This program, which was initiated at Kalamazoo College in 1963-65 and has now been introduced on a number of campuses in New York, involves a supervised program of self-instruction with external assessment of student performance. In the spring of 1972 more than 1,000 men and women were learning to speak Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Swahili, or 1 of 21 other languages, for full credit, without classroom instruction of any kind. An essential element in the program is the assistance of native speakers as tutors or consultants, who are paid at an hourly rate. The handbook notes that such native speakers are typically exchange students on scholarships or foreign students regularly enrolled at the institution. It points out that as the foreign students are *not* to be employed as language teachers, their field of study is immaterial. The only basic requirement is that they be educated speakers of the standard form of the language being studied.

3. Cooperative Education Program. At Northeastern University

there are some 800 foreign students enrolled, two-thirds of whom are engaged in the Cooperative Education Program. The Program comprises five years of work and study for the baccalaureate degree and three years for the associate degree. After a freshman year of full-time study, the students move into the cooperative plan, spending one quarter in classroom work and one quarter on work assignments. The foreign students have F-1 visas, and permission to engage in the work period is obtained through submission of the I-538 form. The students obtain this privilege as an alternative to postgraduate practical training.

4. PETECA (Program of Educational and Technical Exchange with Central America and the Caribbean). Organized by the Southeastern Regional Office of the Institute of International Education, this program involves the cooperative efforts of educational loan agencies (Educreditos) in Central America, a number of junior and community colleges and technical institutes in the southeastern part of the United States, various local corporate and civic agencies, and the IIE. The Educredito provides long-term, low-interest-rate loans to qualified students, the junior or community college offers waivers of out-of-state tuition or other support, local organizations assist in finding supplementary employment for the PETECA students. The IIE coordinates the selection and placement of the students and sponsors their exchange visitor visas. As of March 1974, 200 students have entered the program and 18 institutions offer programs. (It should be noted that the Pan American Association of Institutions for Education Loans [APICE] lists 13 member institutions in various Central and South American countries.)

5. AID Programs. In 1971, 5,307 participants in Agency for International Development (AID) training programs were enrolled in 375 education institutions in the United States. The question of increasing the number of colleges and universities engaged in these AID training programs has been raised several times, especially in regard to the inclusion of some of the smaller but academically sound institutions. Although there is a tendency on the part of the training officers to turn to those institutions with which they are most familiar, it has been stated that any interested institution is welcome to explore the possibility of enrolling AID participants in programs that will meet

their learning needs.

6. Joint Degree Programs. In 1968 Brandeis University was actively exploring the possibility of the Two-Two Program—a joint degree program with foreign universities which would operate reciprocally and by mutual validation of credits. It was proposed that the foreign student from the cooperating university, after the freshman year at his home institution, would come to Brandeis for two years and then return home for the senior year. The Brandeis student would take his second and third year at the foreign university and return to complete his degree requirements at Brandeis.

Although the plan was abandoned because of the problem of equating the credits given in a three-year university course with those given in a four-year university course, and the problem of funding the exchange of students, the idea was enthusiastically supported in principle by the faculty of Brandeis University, and a recent inquiry suggests that the principle is still valid, if some way could be found to solve the problems.

7. Curriculum Adjustment. In 1970 a distinguished group of educators in the field of business administration met in a three-day conference to discuss ways of improving the educational experience of students from Latin America who come to the United States to study business administration. The report of their discussions was published by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Their recommendations suggest that at the undergraduate level, such students could be provided with a program that would be consistent with the educational program in the United States, while providing the student with an educational experience that would be more consistent with the needs of the home country. They suggested that this might be effected by counseling the student with regard to the elective courses and recommended the use of faculty advisers who were familiar with the conditions in the student's home country. It was anticipated that the report might be used to generate further thinking with respect to the Latin American student who comes to the United States to study business administration.

8. Consortia. A number of institutions have joined together in consortia to provide the specialized services and programs that are involved in foreign student programs. The Regional Council for Inter-

national Education is a notable example of such a cooperative activity. In further exploration of the approach, the NAFSA Field Service Program in 1970 funded a study of the feasibility of operating regional centers for the teaching of English as a second language and the processing of foreign student admissions. With some significant geographical differences due to the concentration of foreign students in certain urban areas, the study indicated that smaller institutions and particularly community colleges would profit from the development of such regional centers. In a later study (1973) following an intensive study of the State University System of Florida, it was strongly recommended that a similar approach for the centralized processing for foreign student admissions and a center for orientation and English-language instruction be instituted in the state.

9. Internationalization of Universities. In 1972 the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities set up a committee to inquire into the question of internationalizing the Swedish university system. The comprehensive proposal resulting from this inquiry includes:

a. a global dimension to all curriculums,
b. expansion of language studies,
c. international exchange of students and teachers,
d. specialized international courses for work in international or foreign posts,
e. measures to make Swedish university education internationally comparable in structure and level.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

*Summary*

- Institutional priorities relate to the community that the institution serves. This community is rapidly becoming internationalized. The foreign undergraduate student may be an important element in the creation, at the undergraduate level, of a necessary international student community.
- The definition of the responsibilities to be assumed with the admission of the foreign undergraduate student may lead to the realization that the institution has offerings that may attract a new and

valuable addition to its educational program.

- Cost, goals, and purposes must be carefully predicted and records kept, so that their validity may be tested.
- Political support for established priorities must be developed within the institution and the national, state, and local communities.
- Financial resources must be sought through the exploration of all possible avenues of support, both for students and for institutions. Justification of the priorities must include plans for the fullest use of the foreign student as an educational resource.
- There must be an imaginative exploration of all the existing or attempted programs—intrainstitutional, interinstitutional, and transnational—designed to develop and enhance the international educational exchange activity.

With these considerations in mind, and with the stretching of the mind in time and space, the institutional priority for foreign undergraduate student programs may be wisely determined.

### *Possible Courses of Action*

The further exploration of the place of the foreign undergraduate student must be focused at two levels:

*Within the college or university.* The developing role of the institution requires the continuing attention of high-level task forces, committees, or commissions, comprising representatives of all interested and authoritative parties, to keep the institution's activities in the field of foreign undergraduate education (including the reciprocal activity of American students abroad) up to date with emerging needs and opportunities.

*At the national level.* There needs to be some direction to the haphazard flow of foreign student applications that are currently received by colleges and universities across the United States. Some national educational task force, preferably with some international participation, might be created to examine this problem and determine ways by which applications are directed to the most appropriate institution and information about the particular educational offerings of interested colleges and universities is more effectively disseminated to prospective foreign students in their home countries.

## Responses to the Paper

Gloria Ilic, who chaired the discussion session following the Jenkins paper, asked that the colloquium participants try to condense the ideas and suggestions Jenkins presented and earlier suggestions into recommendations that are both valid and broad enough to represent a consensus of the colloquium's concerns.

### *Reports from the Discussion Groups*

*Group I.* Mary Ann Spreckelmeyer reported that the group thought it should be the responsibility of the foreign student adviser to develop an inventory of an institution's total resources for international education—faculty, programs, number of students—to help elicit a response from the power structure regarding institutional commitment. Such an assessment can include a consideration of a curriculum that is aimed at benefiting both foreign and American students by reflecting and even anticipating the changing needs in other parts of the world.

Regarding the "traffic cop" concept, the group was in favor of a regional monitoring system and suggested that, prior to establishing such a system, a feasibility study be made and a model program be set up in one region. The study might be designed by NLC members and would also take into account the views of foreign students, representatives from other countries, institutional representatives including faculty, and funding organizations.

The group also recommended that alumni contacts be developed to form a link for foreign students between their educational experience here and their professional development at home; that NAFSA develop an associational policy on proprietary schools; that institutions, as a part of their commitment, look into the benefits in dollars of foreign students—what they bring us and take away in terms of the balance of payments.

* * *

*Group II.* There was a general feeling, reported by Ross Alm, that the relevance of the terms "happenstance" and "self-interest" indicate a need for improving services for foreign students. They need better counseling and education, first, and once they are here better cross-cultural experiences, such as the cooperative living situations at Stan-

ford and Indiana Universities. In this way foreign students can contribute to the internationalization of American students, learn about the life-styles of the Americans, and still retain the customs of their own culture.

As for the "traffic cop" concept, the group had doubts about its feasibility.

Group II discussed the role of the community college in detail, on the basis of information presented by Joseph Jacobsen on the program at the City College of San Francisco. Jacobsen urged that efforts be made to increase the number of programs of government, foundations, and industry for foreign students to enroll in the technical programs offered by community colleges. There was discussion of possibly restricting foreign students to these programs, thus giving them the most beneficial training for the home country and discouraging them from extending their stay here by transferring to a four-year college and possibly running out of funds. It was suggested that these programs might offer college credit for practical training in local businesses during the academic year or vacation or when the study term is completed, and that, with the lowering of academic and language requirements, these programs would be used to make education available to students on a lower economic level. Several sections of the proposal were amended during debate, both in Group II and in the general discussion session.[1]

* * *

*Group III.* Reporting for the group, Harriet Marsh expressed concern that certain recruiting practices might lead to a decline of academic standards and that integrity is not always observed in recruiting and admitting foreign students. It was thought that the use of a clearinghouse system would offend those institutions that might be considered inappropriate for the more brilliant students. However, since it was felt that the foreign student has a real need for early guidance, the group suggested more and better overseas counseling and the dissemination of objective information about the myriad postsecondary institutions here, including description of the cultural climate of the institution so that the student can select one that is compatible with

1. See the note on page 41 for the final form of Jacobsen's statement.

his personality and needs.

The group also considered the need for going beyond the rhetoric and gathering solid information regarding the internationalization of society through the admittance of foreign students. Regrettably we find that when we're attempting to influence legislators we must often rely on anecdotes to make a point instead of objective data. Since foreign students do not usually receive a high priority at many institutions, it was hoped that such national organizations as NAFSA and ACE could gather information and present the arguments to legislators and college administrators, rather than leaving the foreign student adviser to convince his or her chief institutional officers of their value. The group recommended that, as part of the information-gathering process, a study be carried out in just one country to see exactly what has happened to the students educated in the United States.

Group III gave recognition, as did the previous groups, to the importance and relevance of the community and junior colleges to growing numbers of foreign students.[2]

2. A statement concerning the growing importance of junior and community colleges in international education was prepared by Gracia Molina de Pick:

A. Local, regional, and national coordinating efforts in the recruitment and placement of foreign students in American institutions of higher education should include and highlight the role of the community and junior colleges, overseas as well as in this country.

B. This colloquium should extend its support to the efforts of the Office of International Programs of the AACJC to create an international body for the promotion and the development of the idea and role of the community and junior college.

C. The flexible, comprehensive nature of the community and junior college as a valid and viable institution of higher learning needs to be projected in a positive and aggressive light in view of the critical, ever increasing demand for middle-level scientific and technical personnel. Community and junior colleges should be recognized as, in fact, equal and key factors in international education. The prestige and status of community and junior colleges as effective partners in *reforming* American higher education to meet our own society's changing needs has been amply demonstrated—witness the significant increase in enrollment at these institutions compared with the decrease in enrollment experienced in four-year institutions. This points to the success of community and junior colleges in *reaching out to a most diverse student population* seeking not only a transfer program but a two-year terminal degree in the technical/vocational programs, as well as the significant increase in the ranks of the paraprofessionals, where many re-entry students (primarily adult women) and many minority students find an accessible, short, viable, and satisfying way into the world of work.

*Group IV.* Reporting for the group, Douglas Conner noted some feeling that the Jenkins paper had concentrated too much on existing conditions instead of on the future. Some members wondered, for example, whether a country's need for trained manpower should even be a factor when the college is admitting and placing a foreign student. And when we speak of allocating resources, in terms of the thousands of nonsponsored foreign students, shouldn't we concentrate on getting a response from government and not just limit ourselves to questions of allocating institutional resources?

A dominant theme in Group IV's discussion was institutional self-study and review. Institutions need to commit or recommit themselves to policies concerning international education—that is, to the total dimension, not just foreign students. This kind of appraisal might be done parallel to other kinds of self-study that the institutions are engaged in—such as affirmative action and minority-group enrollment. The self-study should be supplemented by a task force to look specifically at foreign students in terms of the university statement or policy role, including all the services that support the foreign student program. It was suggested that if the task force failed to tie in the foreign student program closely enough to the overall problems institutions are facing, then the foreign student adviser or admissions officer might have to take on the job of developing the kind of perspective that he or she would need to relate to the institutional role.

Included as a part of the institutional reassessment, some of the group felt, should be a concern with English-language proficiency. A short statement prepared by one member of the group was submitted to the chairman of the colloquium.[3]

The group also reemphasized the necessity of involving all kinds of postsecondary institutions in our concerns. Identify them, communi-

3. Shigeo Imamura presented the following statement: English-language proficiency has always been a serious problem in the scene of foreign student education, especially at the level of immediate postsecondary education, at many large institutions as well as small ones. At this stage of self-re-evaluation of postsecondary education for foreign students it is strongly recommended that the teaching of English as a second language be given due consideration in the planning of overall improvement under the guidance of professionals. Institutions that are not professionally equipped to provide instruction in the teaching of English as a second language, for example, should refer their students to reputable existing language centers as needs arise.

cate with them, recognize the unique services that they can provide for foreign students, learn from them, and seek involvement in assisting them to contribute to the total benefit of international education and of foreign students elsewhere. For example, at a working conference with proprietary institutions and foreign student associations the question of recruitment of foreign students might lead to an interesting exchange: what we can offer them in the way of recruitment ethics and what they might offer us in the way of marketing techniques.

Group IV endorsed the idea of establishing an international organization for foreign student affairs and urged that we develop communication lines between international organizations, explore what is now taking place (for example, the Japanese Association for Foreign Student Affairs program and others), and proceed toward a true international students' association that would benefit foreign students through the exchange of information.

### *General Colloquium Discussion*

At the conclusion of the reports from the four groups, Gloria Ilic led a general discussion session in an informal consideration of the recommendations that had been proposed by individuals and groups. She asked for opinions, contradictions, additions, and clarification relating to the recommendations, so that the final recommendations would for the most part reflect the consensus of the whole group as closely as possible.

Discussion about the international education office of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges was concerned with its efforts toward developing community colleges for accreditation overseas and its past work for foreign students in this country.

In regard to the idea that we need improved information sources overseas, the overseas workshop projects of the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions were mentioned.

Regarding the "clearinghouse" concept in Jenkins's paper, there was clarification of the essentially *voluntary* nature of a proposed organization for evaluating students' credentials.

A good deal of discussion focused on the proposal that community colleges limit the enrollment of foreign students to two-year terminal programs in vocational-technical fields. Concern was expressed that

students would enroll expecting to be able to transfer to a four-year college. Some felt that such expectations were the right of foreign students. Others felt that the limitation must be made very clear to the student. Some participants were strongly opposed to such restrictions on foreign students—especially since American students are not so restricted. The final wording of the proposal reflects the objections raised in the discussion, through use of the phrase: community colleges "should consider giving the highest priority to foreign students" interested in two-year terminal programs.[4]

An additional recommendation surfaced in the general discussion, regarding the need for associational linkages, particularly with financial aid offices at colleges and universities. More and better communication with financial aid offices will be useful in admissions. And the aid officer in turn can help us look for funds to support programs from sources that the associations don't have access to.

As the general discussion concluded, participants were reminded that, as foreign students are a very diversified group, probably few generalizations apply to "foreign students" and that we are dealing with the problems of individual students in our own institutions that have to be isolated and identified. All of us will return to our institutions and associations and try to set up the strategies that will be most appropriate.

4. See the text of the Jacobsen proposal in a note on page 41.

# 5. Recommendations

The recommendations made by the colloquium to serve as guidelines to institutions are necessarily broad. While there was general agreement among participants on most recommendations, occasional dissenting opinions were expressed and are included in the summaries of the discussion sessions. Several participants prepared brief written statements, which are included in the report, although they were not adopted as recommendations.

In the field of international education there is an extraordinary diversity among institutions, students, and programs. At present the flow of undergraduate foreign students into American postsecondary institutions can be characterized largely by two elements: institutional self-interest in admitting students and happenstance (the lack of a discernible pattern in the choice of institutions by students). Many participants felt that these concepts of self-interest and happenstance had more immediacy and relevance to foreign student programs than the theoretical ordering of institutional priorities, and that therefore the primary concern should be to do the best possible job with the present situation. From this viewpoint, recommendations for the improvement of services to foreign students included the following:

### *1. Information sources overseas*

Increasing the opportunities of prospective foreign students to get adequate information about institutions in the United States is an important role of the reliable professional counseling centers now overseas, such as those sponsored by American agencies—for example, the American Friends of the Middle East, the Institute of International Education, and the African-American Institute—and bona fide binational centers sponsored by the United States and home governments. It is recommended that existing information sources be improved, that institutions be encouraged to use them, and that admissions officers be made aware of the role of the overseas centers and of how to take advantage of their services. Institutions should develop additional information and supply it to these centers.

*2. Integrity in admissions*

Admissions officers are increasingly under pressure to enroll more students, without due regard for the students' qualifications and the appropriateness of their institution's programs. It is recommended that institutions supply the foreign student with sufficient information about their programs to assist the student in making a good choice. Any relaxation of standards should be accompanied by suitable tutorial and support services.

*3. Clearinghouses*

Both students and institutions may be assisted by the establishment of central clearinghouses in the United States to ease the application process and assure a good match. It is recommended that institutions be encouraged to form regional groupings or consortia to assure optimal routing of applications.

*4. Curricular reform*

It is recommended that a study be undertaken of how to broaden those undergraduate curriculums that include an international dimension, in order to improve the educational experience of both American and foreign students and with a view toward reducing the parochialism of American students.

*5. Legislation*

It is recommended that efforts be made to lobby for legislation advantageous to foreign students, such as relaxing restrictions on summer employment. Efforts to influence legislators should rely on solid data rather than anecdotes.

*6. Service to institutions*

It is recommended that the efforts of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and others to educate institutions to their manifold responsibilities toward foreign students be continued and intensified.

* * *

In addition to efforts to improve existing ways of assuring the best

possible educational experience for undergraduate foreign students, those who work with the students can also look ahead toward developing more coherent policy and more effective procedures. Recommendations for action by institutions, organizations, and individuals included the following:

*7. Institutional self-study*

It is recommended each institution form a high-level task force to conduct a self-study and review. Institutions should be encouraged to commit themselves to policies based on an examination of all aspects of international higher education programs. The study would deal specifically with every aspect of the institution's international program, including foreign graduate and undergraduate students, visiting scholars, visiting professors, support services to foreign students and scholars, English-language proficiency programs, curriculum development, the dollar value of the student to the institution, study abroad, and benefits to American students. If a task force is not or cannot be formed, the persons on campus responsible for foreign students should assume responsibility to seek an institutional priority for strengthening services for them.

*8. Research*

More information is needed on foreign students who have returned to their countries. It is recommended that alumni contacts be used to follow the professional development of returned foreign students. Professional organizations and individual colleges are encouraged to consider at least conducting a pilot study in a selected country of the impact of foreign students who have returned after completing study in the United States.

*9. Two-year colleges*

It is recommended that, as further attention is given to the undergraduate education of foreign students, coordinated efforts be made at both regional and national levels to include junior and community colleges. Further consideration should be given to the suggestion of several participants that the number of terminal programs in two-year colleges should be increased and foreign students encouraged to enroll

in these. It is recognized that two-year terminal programs may be an appropriate choice for some foreign students.

*10. Proprietary schools*

It is recommended that the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, and other professional organizations make concerted efforts to involve proprietary schools in national and regional activities. The concern of the international education community should be with all "postsecondary" institutions, not only those in the "higher education" category.

*11. Liaison with financial aid office*

It is recommended that professional associations make concerted efforts to expand their involvement with financial aid officers, with the hope that the financial aid officers will become more active participants in future planning.

*12. Accrediting*

It is recommended that regional accrediting agencies be asked to include references to foreign student admissions and services as part of the routine evaluation procedures.

*13. International foreign student association*

It is recommended that the ties among existing organizations be strengthened, bringing them closer together in their common interest and eventually making possible an international association of foreign student organizations.

# Participants in the Colloquium June 20-21, 1974[1]

Ross C. Alm
Director of Admissions
Mankato State College

August G. Benson
Foreign Student Advisor
Office of International Studies and Programs
Michigan State University

Stan Berry
Director of Admissions
Washington State University

Arthur F. Byrnes
Deputy Director
Office of International Training
Agency for International Development
Department of State

Eugene R. Chamberlain
Adviser for Foreign Students
Office of Admissions
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Eugene L. Clubine
Coordinator
Office of International Educational Services
Iowa State University

Mary T. Coleman
Director
Moton Consortium on Admissions and Financial Aid

J. Douglas Conner
Executive Secretary
American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

Virgil C. Crippin
President
American Friends of the Middle East, Inc.

Howard A. Cutler
Executive Vice President
Institute of International Education

Thomas J. Diener
Director
Institute of Higher Education Research and Services
University of Alabama

Mark C. Ebersole
Dean of the Graduate School
Temple University

Robert L. Fischelis
Fellowship Officer
The Rockefeller Foundation

James S. Frey
Assistant Director of Admissions
Indiana University

Rose Lee Hayden
Associate Director
International Education Project
American Council on Education

Stirling L. Huntley
Director of Admissions and Financial Aid
Associate Dean of Graduate Studies
California Institute of Technology

Gloria H. Ilic
Division Head
Foreign Student Placement
Institute of International Education

1. Affiliations shown are those that were current at the time of the colloquium.



145

Shigeo Imamura
Director of English Language Center
Michigan State University

Joseph M. Jacobsen
Foreign Student Adviser
City College of San Francisco

Sanford C. Jameson
International Education
College Entrance Examination Board

Hugh M. Jenkins
Executive Vice President
National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

Lornie Kerr
Dean of Student Affairs
Northwestern Michigan College

Daniel T. Langdale
Associate Director
Student Financial Aid Office
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Josephine Leo
Director
Office of International Education Services
University of Maryland

Harriet Marsh
Director of Resident Affairs
International House

Alistair McCrone
Academic Vice President
University of the Pacific
President-Elect
Humboldt State University

E. E. Oliver
Director
University Office of School and College Relations
University of Illinois

Diane L. Olsen
Associate Editor
College Entrance Examination Board

Stephen Palmer
Fellow
Center for International Affairs
Harvard University

William S. Patrick
Vice President for Student Services
Georgia State University

Gracia Molina de Pick
Professor
Spanish Literature Department
San Diego Mesa College

Lorene L. Rogers
Vice President
University of Texas at Austin

Edmund G. Ryan, S.J.
Office of the Executive Vice President for Educational Affairs
Georgetown University

Dante V. Scalzi
Director
International Center
Pennsylvania State University

Albert G. Sims
Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board

Catherine S. Sims
Dean
Sweet Briar College

Cliff Sjogren
*Colloquium Director*
Director of Admissions
University of Michigan

Joel B. Slocum
Director
Foreign Student Services
Columbia University

Mary Ann Spreckelmeyer
Chief
Foreign Student Program
Office of Youth, Student, and
Special Programs
Bureau of Educational and
Cultural Affairs
Department of State

Ronald E. Springwater
Director
Division of Education
African-American Institute

Ralph H. Vogel
Executive Secretary
Office of the Chairman
Board of Foreign Scholarships
Bureau of Educational and
Cultural Affairs
Department of State

Lee O. Wilcox
Director of Admissions
University of Wisconsin – Madison

Joseph F. Williams
Director
Office of Foreign Student Affairs
State University of New York
at Buffalo

A. Lee Zeigler
Director
Bechtel International Center
Stanford University

## *The Johnson Foundation Staff*

Leslie Paffrath
President

Henry Halsted
Vice President – Program

Rita Goodman
Vice President – Area Programs

Estelle Linzer
Program Consultant – New York

Kay Mauer
Conference Coordinator

# Selected Bibliography

Several publications were sent to colloquium participants before the meeting, to serve as background information. Others were available at the meeting. Still other reports and articles were recommended by speakers.


Bayer, Alan E., "Foreign Students in American Colleges: Time for Change in Policy and Practice." *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. I, 1973 (APS Publications, Inc.), pp. 391-400.

Fuller, Robin S., "Developing an Institutional Purpose in International Education." Paper delivered at NAFSA annual conference in Detroit, Michigan, May 1973. 6 pp.

*A Guide for the Education of Foreign Students: Human Resources Development*, ed. by August G. Benson and Joseph W. Kovach (Washington, D.C.: NAFSA, 1974). 59 pp.

Jacobsen, Joseph, "A Realistic Foreign Student Program for Our Two-Year Colleges." Paper prepared at City College of San Francisco, supplemented by a list of foreign students at this community college classified by majors in a variety of semiprofessional fields and by country. Spring 1974 and Fall 1974.

Leestma, Robert, "Reflections on the Internationalization of Higher Education."

NAFSA Position Paper on Laws and Regulations Governing International Educational Interchange. December 4, 1973. 7 pp.

Palmer, Stephen, *Toward Improved U.S. Immigration and International Education Programs.*

Richardson, Barrie, "International Studies for Undergraduates," *Newsletter* of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. January 1974 (Washington, D.C.), pp. 17-20.

Sjogren, Cliff, "Foreign Students in Michigan Community and Junior Colleges: An Analysis of Present Conditions, Experiences, and Expectations." Abstract of doctoral dissertation at University of Michigan, 1972.

Winkler, Karen J., "Closing the Books on Foreign Students," *International, Educational, and Cultural Exchange*, Vol. IX, Nos. 2-3 (Fall 1973 – Winter 1974), pp. 17-19.